DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 741 SP 005 952

TITLE	A Questionnaire Evaluation System for Teacher Education Centers in Greater Cleveland.
INSTITUTION	Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, Ohio.
SPONS AGENCY	Martha Holden Jennings Foundation, Pittsburgh, Pa.
PUB DATE	Jul 72
NOTE	236p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	College School Cooperation; *Cooperating Teachers; Educational Research; *Evaluation; Evaluation Techniques; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Student Teachers; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

Following a brief overview of the teacher education center movement in Greater Cleveland, a questionnaire evaluation system designed to evaluate the center is described. The system is designed to enable questionnaire responses from student teachers, cooperating teachers, and center coordinators to be developed into two distinct kinds of reports. These reports include a direct report back to the center in the form of a tabulation of the responses of student teachers and cooperating teachers from that particular center and an area-wide summary of all questionnaires from the Metropolitan area. Seventeen centers participated in this pilot study, questionnaires were sent to 193 student teachers and 179 cooperating teachers. Completed questionnaires were returned by 49 percent of the student teachers and 65 percent of the cooperating teachers. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) permitted computerized tabulation of the questionnaires. Tabulation of the 17 coordinators was done manually. Guidelines for the establishment of a similar evaluation system are presented. Appendixes include details of the questionnaire and the SPSS program. (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 070741

A QUESTIONNAIRE EVALUATION SYSTEM
FOR
TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS
IN
GREATER CLEVELAND

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by
Dr. David E. O'Gorman
Assistant Director for Teacher Education
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

and

Dr. Rae Rohfeld, Consultant

prepared as part of the

PROJECT TO STIMULATE INNOVATIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION
(SITE PROJECT)

Funded by a Grant from the

Martha Holden Jennings Foundation

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Cleveland, Ohio 44114

July, 1972

SP 005 952

FOREWORD

Thanks are in order to many individuals throughout the Cleveland Metropolitan Area who participated in the design and initial use of this evaluation system. Particular thanks is due to David McCrory, Coordinator of the Beachwood Middle School Teacher Education Center, who put together the initial list of questions for inclusion in the questionnaires, and who participated with the members of the Executive Committee of the Greater Cleveland Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee in the process of modification and revision of several drafts of each of three questionnaires.

The members of the Executive Committee of the Greater Cleveland Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee are:

Dr. Patrick Cosiano, Director of the Cleveland Center for Ohio University

Mr. Jerry Graham, Chairman, Social Studies Department, Shaker Heights High School

Mr. Larry Mervine, Chairman, Social Studies Department, Kirk Junior High School, East Cleveland, Ohio

Miss Edna Stinson, John Carroll University/Cleveland Public Schools MAT Program

Dr. Sally Wertheim, Assistant Professor, John Carroll University

Dr. Rae Rohfeld has served as an objective observer of the Teacher Education Center process for over a year. Her insightful analysis of the data generated from this questionnaire system which appears in Chapter III is particularly appreciated.

Last but not least, thanks to my wife, Mary Ann O'Gorman, who coded the responses to the open ended questions and who wrote the SPSS computer program.

David E. O'Gorman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Foreword i

I. The Teacher Education Center Movement in Greater Cleveland. 1

II. The Design of a Questionnaire Evaluation System. . . . 3

III. An Evaluation of Greater Cleveland Teacher Education Centers. 5

IV. A Guide for the Implementation of The Approach in Other Metropolitan Areas 14

APPENDICES

A. Tabulation of Responses to the Center Coordinator's Survey - Spring 1972

B. Tabulation of Responses to the Cooperating Teacher's Survey - Spring 1972

C. Tabulation of Responses to the Student Teacher's Survey - Spring 1972

D. Verbatim Responses to Open-Ended Questions From The Cooperating Teachers Survey

E. Verbatim Responses to Open-Ended Questions From The Student Teachers Survey

F. Coordinator Questionnaire

G. Cooperating Teacher Questionnaire

H. Student Teacher Questionnaire

I. Computer Program - Cooperating Teacher Questionnaire

J. Computer Program - Student Teacher Questionnaire

K. Description of The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

I. The Teacher Education Center Movement in Greater Cleveland

With the support of the Martha Holden Jennings Foundation the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education has undertaken a three year activity to Stimulate Innovations in Teacher Education Programs in the Greater Cleveland Schools, Colleges and Universities (SITE Project). The major innovation which the SITE Project selected to stimulate in the Greater Cleveland Metropolitan area is the Teacher Education Center.

Teacher education centers are joint ventures of one or more elementary and secondary schools together with one or more colleges, and are designed to improve the student teaching phase of teacher preparation. The term "center" is somewhat of a misnomer because in this context it refers to a set of innovative activities, rather than a place. Some centers are located in several buildings, and both students and staff have experiences in each building of a center.

The distinction between the conventional approach to student teaching and the center approach may be seen in the following table:

	Problems with the conventional approach	The "Center" approach as a way of resolving the problems
Assignment of Student Teachers	Scattered in many schools.	Clustered in buildings, chosen for particular experiences.
Supervision of Student Teachers	Individual students supervised daily by master teacher, infrequently by college faculty member (referred to as college supervisor). Minimal communication between college and school supervisors. No coordination of in-school activities.	Directly, by master teacher. Indirectly by college supervisor, through teacher. Frequently in-school program has part-time or full-time coordinator.
College Supervisor's Activity	"Circuit-rider" - visiting students in many locations.	Concentrated at center, available to student teachers and to all school personnel as an added resource.
Preparation of master-teacher for supervisory role	Varies--usually minimal.	Workshops and other efforts to incorporate master teacher into teacher training team.
Seminar on teaching	On campus, frequently not related to student teaching experience.	Usually at center, tied to experience in teaching.

Effect on School environment	No direct effort to help school program.	A direct effort made to improve the learning environment within the school.
Variety of Student Teaching Experiences	Usually one classroom with one master teacher. Little opportunity to visit other classes.	Often contact with two or more classes and teaching styles; sometimes assignments are to a teaching team or to a whole department.
Decision-making	College dominated and imposed.	School-college partnership.

As far as the SITE Project is concerned, the essential element which constitutes a center is a school-college partnership. The school-college partnership is manifested by the existence of a "center-team," consisting of representatives of both the school and college.

It is important to emphasize that "Center" strategy is aimed, not at increasing the number of teachers trained, but rather at improving the quality of those who are trained. College and school personnel agree that this is best done through intensive integration of instructional theory with school-based clinical teaching experience. The center concept embodies this bridging approach.

The number of Teacher Education Centers in Greater Cleveland has grown rapidly. Only 5 centers were being planned prior to the start of the SITE Project in mid 1970. By May of 1971, at the end of the first year of SITE, the number in operation grew to 17. During this current 1971-72 school year the number of centers has more than doubled to a total of 35, involving some 50 elementary and secondary schools.

These days innovative approaches in schools do not succeed without the enthusiastic support of the teachers. The rapid growth of centers would not have been possible without their support. Approximately 250 teachers are involved in centers. This is twice what it was one year ago.

The coordination of the teacher education centers movement in Greater Cleveland is achieved through a coordinating committee made up of one representative from each center. Those representatives then elect a 5 member executive committee to handle the ongoing activities of the Greater Cleveland Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee. The SITE Project through the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education provides a professional and secretarial staff to the Committee. The full Committee meets several times per year to set policy and monitor progress. The Executive Committee meets monthly with the staff.

II. The Design of a Questionnaire Evaluation System

From the start of the teacher education centers movement in the Greater Cleveland area in 1970-71 the question of how to evaluate teacher education centers was a primary concern. In workshops in October, 1970, February and May of 1971, representatives from teacher education centers in the Cleveland Metropolitan Area began to focus on some of the problems related to the evaluation of centers.

The problem of how to evaluate teacher education centers was an elusive one. In addition to the normal methodological problems involved in any research project, the question of evaluation of teacher education centers was made more difficult because most centers were in early stages of development, and the several colleges and universities working with several school districts spawned a wide variety of approaches to the partnership arrangements called "teacher education centers."

By the time the Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee met in December of 1971 the development of centers in the Greater Metropolitan Area had stablized. With that stability came a recognition that there was no one "right" definition of a center, and that the central purposes of attempts to collaborate for the immediate present were to cooperate in gathering feedback from participants in individual centers, sharing information and experience, and planning future cooperation based on those results.

The shift away from the notion that there was one "model" for teacher education centers that could or should be implemented both compounded the evaluation problems and at the same time shed additional light on the nature of the task of evaluation. It became clear that no one research design could encompass the diverse kinds and types of partnership arrangements that were developing. But at the same time there was a recognition that individual centers under development had a need for internal feedback from their cooperating teachers and from their student teachers. At the same time it became apparent that additional information was needed by the Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee to monitor and evaluate the rapid growth of centers in the Cleveland Metropolitan Area.

The Coordinating Committee thus decided to undertake a questionnaire evaluation which would (1) provide direct feedback to individual centers, and (2) provide information to the Greater Cleveland Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee for its use in planning future collaborative activities on an area-wide basis. It was further determined that such a system should be set up in a way that would allow easy repetition in succeeding years but in a manner which would allow revisions in the questionnaires.

Thus, the system described in this report is designed to enable questionnaire responses from student teachers, cooperating teachers, and center coordinators to be developed into two distinct kinds of report: 1) a direct report back to the center in the form of a tabulation of the responses of student teachers and cooperating teachers from that particular center, and 2) an area-wide summary of all the questionnaires from the Metropolitan area.

Because of the uncertainties regarding the kinds of questions and methods by which the questionnaires would be tabulated, it was determined that this first approach would be a pilot study of only a group of the centers in operation. Some 17 centers elected to participate in the pilot project.

Questionnaires were sent to 193 student teachers and 179 cooperating teachers. Completed questionnaires were received from 49% of the student teachers and 65% of the cooperating teachers.

It was apparent that the amount of work needed to prepare reports for individual centers as well as for the area-wide summary could be substantial. Therefore, it was decided to utilize the capabilities of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). A brief description of SPSS is included in Appendix K. SPSS programs permit the questionnaires to be coded for key punching and put on cards and in one run of the computer the tabulations are printed out for all of the individual centers plus the area-wide total. SPSS was used for the questionnaires of the 116 cooperating teachers and the 94 student teachers. Tabulation of the 17 coordinators was done manually.

Guidelines for the establishment of a similar system either in other metropolitan areas or by a college or university are included in Chapter 4 of this report. The Appendices contain details of the questionnaires, the tabulations, and the SPSS programs.

III. An Evaluation of Greater Cleveland Teacher Education Centers

by

Dr. Rae Rohfeld

Introduction

In March, 1972 the Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee, associated with the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, conducted a questionnaire study of student teachers, cooperating teachers and Teacher Education Center Coordinators in 17 Greater Cleveland centers. For most centers, this was the second year of operation. The purpose of the study was both to assess the current quality of teacher education in the centers and to test and refine some tools to be used for yearly evaluation of the centers. From the earliest period of the center movement one of the concerns has been the necessity of developing an evaluation system. This report will analyze the composite data on centers obtained through the questionnaires, and discuss the implications of the data in both areas of concern: the teacher education process and the center evaluation process.

Separate questionnaires were sent to center coordinators, cooperating teachers, and student teachers. They were returned by 17 coordinators, 116 cooperating teachers, and 94 student teachers.

The Teacher Education Process

A. The Development of TEC Characteristics

Do we really have Teacher Education Centers? A number of questions relate to the extent to which the student teaching environments are becoming actual teacher education centers. The data casts light on five TEC characteristics.

1. School-college partnership in teacher education

The partnership approach is central to the concept of a teacher education center, and shared decision-making might be viewed as the essence of such a partnership. In response to question 11 in the coordinators' questionnaire, 70.6% reported that the college or university and school have a mechanism for cooperatively determining general policy. Only 25% of those responding "yes" think the mechanism is extremely useful; the remainder find it "somewhat useful."

In regard to specific decisions, 58.8% of the coordinators report that they assign student teachers to cooperating teachers,[1] either on their own or in cooperation with others, and 53% report that cooperating teachers were chosen either by center coordinators or jointly by school and college personnel.[2] 69% of the cooperating teachers said expectations of them were jointly determined by school and college.[3] Since the center coordinators theoretically represent the school and college jointly, their responsibilities, decisions, and activities may be regarded as representing the partnership. (This assumption might be limited somewhat by the fact that 53% of the coordinators are paid entirely by the colleges and only 11.8% clearly indicate shared contributions to their salaries).[4] On the other hand, when we come to coordinator's question 18, "Who makes decisions about student teaching?" only 35.3% report the decisions are shared equally; 35.3% state the college, mainly, makes them, and 23.5% say the school personnel are mainly responsible.

It appears that the centers could profitably examine the issue of the school-college (or university) partnership, focussing on the question, "What is the nature of the teacher education partnership?"

2. Breadth and Variety of Experience

The main information on breadth and variety of training experience comes from questions 7 and 27 - 30 in the student teacher questionnaire which deal with the number and grade levels of teachers with whom student teachers have contact. 42.6% of the students indicate that only one teacher helps them; 33% report two help them. Still, 60.7% of the students say they work with other teachers frequently or very frequently. The work is almost always on one grade level, however, for only 27.7% say they work with other grade levels frequently or very frequently. The responses show only a little more variety when it comes to studying other experiences--59% say they study other teachers frequently or very frequently, but only 33% study other grade levels as often. Perhaps as a result of this limited exposure, 83% of the student teachers want to teach the same age group when they get jobs.[5]

3. Clustering students to build a community

A center is envisioned as an environment in which enough students may be grouped to 1) provide peer group support and sharing, and 2) to warrant the full time commitment of a college faculty member. Among center coordinators, 53% report centers training 6-10 students per term, and 35% report centers training 1-5 students per term. Only 11.8% (2 centers out of 17) had more than 10 student teachers per term.[6] Centers might wish to consider what the optimal size is for meeting their goals.

4. Roles of center staff members

In the center concept one expects college faculty members to view themselves as trainers of trainers, working through cooperating teachers to train student teachers. Cooperating teachers should in turn view themselves as teacher trainers. The survey did not question subjects about their role perceptions, but their activities and training has some bearing on identifying the respective roles. Among center coordinators, 64.7% have had no training for the coordinator's position; of those who have had training, 50% found it extremely helpful and 33.3% found it somewhat helpful.[7] 53% of the coordinators report that they plan and implement the in-service programs in the school related to student teaching, and 82% say they hold seminars for cooperating teachers.[8] What occurs in these sessions is not clear, however, for 63.8% of the cooperating teachers say they were not trained for supervision,[9] and 26.7% of the cooperating teachers suggest training for cooperating teachers as the most effective contribution universities could make to help them be more effective professionals.[10] While many felt a need for training, 51% of the cooperating teachers either could not say what they were unprepared for or did not feel they were unprepared for any aspect of their responsibility to student teachers,[11] and 69.1% of the student teachers thought their cooperating teachers were extremely competent with them.[12]

5. Teacher education continuum

A strong point of the center concept is that it can provide an environment for teacher education from pre-student teaching field work through student teaching to in-service education for professional teachers and administrators. The questionnaires did not deal with pre-student teaching activities, but the number of times the need for earlier field experience was mentioned indicates that most centers do not focus on these activities. On the other end of the continuum, 41% of the coordinators say they provide in-service not related to student teaching[13] but in responding to what major thing the colleges could do to help the coordinators be more effective, the suggestion they made most often (23.5%) was "provide more meaningful inservice".[14] The same suggestion was made by 10.3% of the cooperating teachers, and represented their second-highest choice, after training as cooperating teachers.[15] The ability to utilize the teacher education center for training at all levels may depend to a great extent on clarification of the nature of the school-college partnership mentioned in item one.

B. The Student Teaching Experience

1. Student Teacher Satisfaction

Students overwhelmingly liked their student-teaching experience, with 66% answering they "definitely" liked it, and 25% answering "somewhat".[16] What they liked best about it was their cooperating teacher; this was offered as the best liked aspect by 37% of the respondees.[17] They found the cooperating teacher to be extremely helpful (72.3%), extremely competent in teaching (75.5) and extremely competent with the student teacher (69.1%).[18] 92.6% felt that the amount of responsibility given to them was just about right.[19] As one would expect, the need for more training for cooperating teachers was felt by the cooperating teachers themselves or by the center coordinators, but never suggested by the students.

2. Coordinators' time commitment

In operating the centers, 35.3% of the coordinators report spending up to 20% of their time on duties related to student teachers and/or cooperating teachers, and another 35.3% of the coordinators report spending 20 to 40% of their time on these duties.[19] Coordinators tend to see this time as insufficient, for, when asked what one thing the school could do to help them be more effective, 23.5% answered that it could provide more release time, and 17.6% said that it could provide more time to work with student teachers and cooperating teachers.[20]

3. The Field Experience Component

One change which all three groups agreed on was the need for more and better field experience to start earlier in the students' education. As one student put it, "Student teachers [should] be more prepared in practical matters before stepping into the classroom".[21] A cooperating teacher thought earlier classroom exposure was important because, "a student should be in the position earlier in his schooling to determine if teaching is what he truly wants and can do. ..."[22] Testing one's interest and developing more practical competence were commonly cited reasons for wanting earlier field experience. Earlier field experience is also supported by students' responses on the utility of their education courses. 36.2% said the courses were somewhat helpful, 21.3% were neutral about them, and only 14.9% found them extremely helpful.[23] On the other hand, after entering student teaching, 61.7% of the students found the content of the education courses more meaningful.[24] This result indicates that the field experiences and methods courses reinforce each other. Bringing them into a closer relationship might increase the satisfaction with the total teacher education process.

4. Competence in student teaching

At the start of student teaching, 39.7% of the cooperating teachers found their student teachers very well prepared; 23.3% thought they were somewhat well prepared, and 22.4% gave a neutral response.[25] While 95.7% of the students felt competent in content[26] only 31% of the cooperating teachers found them extremely knowledgeable in subject matter, and 52.6% found them somewhat competent.[27] In relating to kids, 43.1% of the cooperating teachers found their students extremely good and 34.5% thought they did fairly well.[28] They saw them relating slightly better to adults, with 49.1% responding "extremely well" and 34.5% "fairly well."[29] These responses may relate to the above considerations concerning prior preparation, and the positive responses might be increased by earlier field experience and counselling of education majors.

5. Seminars

The seminar is required with student teaching but while 66% of the students definitely liked student teaching, only 6.4% found the seminars extremely useful, and only 22% felt they were able to share experiences heavily with other student teachers. 50% felt they shared experiences a moderate amount, and 27% felt they had no opportunity to share experiences. 59.6% thought the seminar somewhat useful, and 33% said it was not at all useful.[30] In other words, in regard to both sharing opportunities and utility, the number of students reporting no benefit exceeded the number reporting heavy benefits.

The individual center data gives some indication that on-site seminars are more successful than seminars at the college--possibly because the on-site seminars involve students at only one location and can focus more directly on a shared experience. On the other hand, there is a good deal of variation in responses among the different on-site seminars.

6. Effect of Student Teaching Experience

By and large the student teaching experience tends to confirm or intensify prior expectations. 69.1% of the student teachers found the schools as they expected,[31] and their concept of kids unchanged.[32] Largest changes came in the student teachers' concepts of themselves, where 30.9% found themselves more confident,[33] and in the concept of teaching, where 25.5% found it more demanding[34] than they had expected. Cooperating teachers were also confirmed in their educational philosophies. 16.4% did not respond to the question on how their philosophies had changed, 45.7% said there was no change, and 12.1% thought the experience with student teachers had broadened their philosophies.[35]

C. Meeting Professional and Community Needs

1. The Communities receiving new teachers.

The Teacher Education Centers studied are preparing students to teach in suburban schools. 76.6% of the student teachers are in suburban schools, 13.8% in urban schools, and 5.3% in inner city schools.[36] These are much like the elementary and secondary schools they attended: 55.3% went to suburban schools and 25.5% went to urban, non-inner city schools.[37] The students wish to stay in similar schools: 55.3% prefer suburban teaching jobs, 16% prefer urban, non-inner-city jobs, and only 4.3% seek inner-city teaching positions.[38] Both the students and their cooperating teachers consider the new teachers best prepared for suburban schools and then, in order, they are prepared for urban, rural, and inner city situations. Cooperating teachers find fewer students "very well prepared" than students report in every category.[39]

The largest number of students (37.2%) chose their schools because they were convenient and they liked them. 30.9% had no choice.[40] Only a few chose the school because of a training goal, such as wanting an open school. A few students wanted a particular cooperating teacher. One did choose an inner-city school because he wanted that experience, and another chose the only school approved of by the university that had majority black student population.[41] If needs for non-suburban schools are going to be met, the students will obviously require a heavy amount of planned exposure to inner-city and rural schools and encouragement to take student teaching in such schools.

2. Community Relations

Despite increasing interest in community schools and community participation in the schools, only 18% of the student teachers are extremely aware of community resources, and 22% are not at all aware.[42] This contrasts markedly with the 50% who are extremely familiar with resources in their schools.[43] This suggests the need for further exploration of school-community relationships within the teacher education process.

D. Implications for Action

1. Center staffs (coordinator, cooperating teachers, and related school and college personnel) should define more clearly the Teacher Education Center model they are working toward. They should consider particularly the nature of the partnership they desire, the respective roles of center staff members, and the optimal size of the center. The Cleveland Commission on Higher Education could support this effort by providing resources--written or personal--on alternative models and their implications.

2. Considerable attention and planning should be given to starting significant classroom experiences as early as the freshman year. Methods courses should be revised and correlated with the field experience. These field experiences could provide a basis for students to choose student teaching assignments with more consideration of their personal learning goals instead of depending on less educationally signficant criteria, such as convenience.

3. In as much as the student teaching experience appears to set expectations and preferences, consideration should be given to expanding student teacher experiences in regard to grade levels, teaching styles, and learning environments. Special efforts should be made to develop centers with inner-city schools. The Cleveland Commission on Higher Education could help seek inner-city sites and help establish school-college relationships.

4. Centers should reexamine their seminars and find ways to relate them to student teacher needs. One approach which they should consider are on-site seminars planned by the student teachers.

5. Means should be developed to involve community people in the center and to involve student teachers in the community--at least to the extent that the students can use community resources in their teaching.

The Center Evaluation Process

A. The Questionnaires

Some changes in the questionnaires would clarify the meaning of questions, simplify tabulation, and assure that the tabulations accurately reflect the individual answers.

The following general principles should guide revision of the three questionnaires:

1. The center concept should be reflected in questions and in answer choices. Many questions force distinctions between school and college or university without providing for "center" as an alternative. Also, some of the questions are difficult for centers where students and cooperating teachers are in other than a 1:1 relationship.
2. In questions where answers fall on a scale, the scale should be revised from a point on a line to a choice of words which will be maintained in the tabulation.
3. Open-ended questions should be avoided as much as possible, since the information they provide is difficult to group and utilize for purposes of improving teacher education. While open-ended questions might be justified in the first questionnaire in order to establish a list of meaningful choices, future questionnaires should be designed to force choices. Open-ended questions could continue to be used when new questions are being tested as additions to the questionnaire; the following year the new question would be incorporated as a forced choice question with the selection of the choices coming, at least partly, from the previous year's answers.
4. The next questionnaires might well reflect the view of one student teacher who said, "Terms such as 'kids' and 'flunky' don't sound very good."

An appropriate role for the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education would be to revise the questionnaires yearly, with the advice of The Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee. In addition, the Commission should distribute the questionnaires, when directed by the TECCC; evaluate the collective data; and circulate the tabulations and over-all evaluation report.

2. Center Evaluation of the Data

Each center must feel confident of its goals,--of the model it has set for itself--in order to have criteria by which to judge the data provided by the questionnaires. This is another reason for individual centers to spend some time focusing on self-definition. Where discrepancies between goals and reality occur, the center needs to find means to bring them closer together. Before the staff can decide on a plan of action, more information may be necessary. Part of the analysis, therefore, involves determining what further information the individual center needs and how it should obtain that information.

Most of the data will not be useful for program improvement until the center personnel can answer the questions, "What does it mean?" or "Why is it this way?" as well as, "Is this what we want to happen?" For example, why do most student teachers want to continue teaching in schools and grades similar to those of their student teaching experience? Is it because they chose their student-teaching experience based on strong knowledge of themselves and the schools, or is it because their student-teaching class is all they know? Or, to take another example, is it desirable that, for many students, their concept of themselves did not change during student teaching? Were they so well-aware of themselves before, or did they simply not receive any help toward increasing self-knowledge. Likewise, is it a strength or a weakness that the educational philosophies of cooperating teachers did not change as a result of working with a student teacher? A desirable outcome in the data cannot be accepted at face value; it is truly desirable only if it is the product of underlying conditions desired by the center.

Once the center identifies necessary changes, it enters into a new program planning phase. It might wish to go beyond its current personnel for help in program improvement. For instance, if the problem involves how to make the seminar more useful, past or present students should help plan improvements. Perhaps the students should run the seminar, or at least participate in its organization. If the center wants to work on its relationships with the community, then community people should participate in program planning. Thus regular evaluation becomes a recurring phase in the process of center development.

In order to assist centers in using their evaluation data for development purposes, the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education could sponsor workshops on the analysis and interpretation of such data. The workshops could utilize case studies from other situations and simulations of decision-making based on survey data to help the participants sharpen their evaluation skills. At least two people from each center should participate in such a workshop. They might then conduct a similar workshop for their own center members.

As centers change and improve their programs, they will, in turn, need to ask new questions in their surveys. Thus, having a means for regularly revising the questionnaire takes on added importance.

Conclusion:

The 1972 Survey of Teacher Education Centers in Greater Cleveland tested a method of evaluation which, after some adjustments are made, and after an evaluation plan is completed, can function on a regular basis with a small amount of professional support from the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education. The survey also pinpointed areas within teacher education which require attention and improvement. While each center must attend to these in accordance with its own image and goals, the Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee and the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education can provide means for exchanging experiences and resources and for bringing in expertise related to the concerns of both small groups of centers and the total center movement in Greater Cleveland.

Notes on Chapter III

KEY

CC: Center Coordinator Questionnaire

CT: Cooperating Teacher Questionnaire

ST: Student Teacher Questionnaire

[1] CC - question 9

[2] CC - question 12

[3] CT - question 15

[4] CC - question 8

[5] ST - question 16

[6] CC - question 1

[7] CC - question 3

[8] CC - question 5

[9] CT - question 2

[10] CT - question 25

[11] CT - question 24

[12] ST - question 5

[13] CC - question 5f

[14] CC - question 14

[15] CT - question 25

[16] ST - question 1

[17] ST - question 2

[18] ST - question 5

[19] CC - question 4

[20] CC - question 15

[21] ST - Verbatim responses, p. 15

[22] CT - verbatim responses, p. 7

[23] ST - question 23

[24] ST - question 24

[25] CT - question 17

[26] ST - question 38a

[27] CT - question 6

[28] CT - question 7

[29] CT - question 8

[30] ST - questions 4 c & d.

[31] ST - question 25

[32] ST - question 33

[33] ST - question 34

[34] ST - question 26

[35] CT - question 22

[36] ST - question 43d

[37] ST - question 43c

[38] ST - question 21

[39] CT - questions 13a-d; ST questions 13 a-d

[40] ST - question 31

[41] ST - verbatim responses, pp. 22-26

[42] ST - question 40

[43] ST - question 39

IV. A Guide for the Implementation of This Approach in Other Metropolitan Areas

The approach to evaluating teacher education centers as described in this report could be adapted for use by other metropolitan coordinating bodies and by individual colleges or universities involved in a number of teacher education centers. Some adaption and modifications to the questionnaires would need to be made in order to insure that the results meet the needs of the users.

The following points are suggested as guidelines for those who might be interested in such an implementation of this basic approach:

1. Modification of questionnaires. (See Appendices F, G, and H for copies of questionnaires). The questionnaires used in this report would need to be modified so that the questions could yield responses that were directly related to the unique teacher education situation of the users. Many of the questions in the questionnaires are open-ended where they should be checklists and some are ambiguous in terms of their wording. Additional questions would need to be added. (See Chapter 3 for a discussion of some needed modifications).

2. Locating an SPSS Program. A computer facility (probably at a local college or university) which has in its library of programs the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences should be located. A meeting with representatives of the facility who are familiar with SPSS should be arranged. The revised questionnaire should be shown to them as well as the questionnaire and tabulations and programs from this study. The result of that meeting should be a plan for the editing and coding procedures, the key punching, and the preparation of the SPSS program. Costs should also be discussed. A range of possible cost would be $50.00 to several hundred dollars, depending on the length of the questionnaires, the computer costs, and who does the editing, coding, and programming. (See Appendices I, J, and K for sample SPSS programs).

3. Distribution of the Questionnaires. The final versions of the questionnaires should be prepared. It is suggested that they be printed on different colored paper in order to simplify the handling of the returned questionnaires. These questionnaires can be distributed in a number of ways. The ways used in the pilot version of the study were:

    a. A direct mailing of the questionnaire including a stamped, return envelope to individual student teachers and cooperating teachers at the school in which they were teaching. In order to do this a list of the names of those personnel were obtained from each center prior to the mailing.

    b. Some of the questionnaires in this study were hand delivered by the College representatives to centers; however, they included a stamped self-returned envelope. The returned envelope was provided to insure the confidentiality of the responses.

4. Handling the Returned Questionnaires. Depending upon the plans made in the meeting with the computer installation staff, the questionnaires need to be edited, coded, key punched and run through the SPSS program. These steps can either be accomplished by the computer installation staff or by those conducting the survey. Verbatim responses to open-ended questions may want to be typed directly from the questionnaires in separate reports. (See Appendices D and E for samples of such verbatim responses). These verbatim responses were also coded and tabulated in the regular SPSS programs.

5. Distribution of Reports. After proofing the first computer print-out, the appropriate number of copies should be prepared either on the computer, through the use of carboned print-out paper, or through other reproduction techniques. It is suggested that three copies of the print-out for each center be prepared: one copy going to the school; one copy going to the university or college; and one copy retained in a central file. In addition, all centers and colleges should receive copies of the area summary totals for comparison purposes.

6. Workshops and Other Analyses. Since the objective of this type of evaluation is to provide information useful for the modification of teacher education centers, it may be useful to consider planning workshops or other activities to help personnel involved in teacher education centers to analyze the data provided through the tabulations and develop goals which would modify their particular programs. In addition, many types of analyses could be performed on the resulted data. Care must be taken to insure the confidentiality of responses and to assure that individual centers or programs or personnel are not embarrassed by the results. Misuse of the data will insure that future cooperation will be seriously impaired.

Members of the Greater Cleveland Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee would be happy to share on a personal basis their experiences with this approach. They can be reached by contacting Chairman, Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee, c/o Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, 1367 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44114. Phone: Area code 216 241-7583.

APPENDIX A

TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO
THE
CENTER COORDINATOR'S SURVEY - SPRING 1972

CONDUCTED BY THE
TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS
COORDINATING COMMITTEE

AS PART OF THE SITE PROJECT
FUNDED BY A GRANT FROM THE
MARTHA HOLDEN JENNINGS FOUNDATION

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
CLEVELAND, OHIO
MAY, 1972

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE     COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE  ALL

VARIABLE QUES 01.  HOW MANY STUDENT TEACHERS ARE YOU RESPONSIBLE FOR PER TERM?


                                                  ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                  FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                              (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                                  ------------------------------------------------
          1-5 STUDENT TEACHERS                        6         35.3        35.3        35.3

         6-10 STUDENT TEACHERS                        9         53.0        53.0        88.2

        11-15 STUDENT TEACHERS                        1          5.9         5.9        94.1

        21-30 STUDENT TEACHERS                        1          5.9         5.9       100.0
                                                    ---       -----       -----       -----
                                     TOTAL           17        100.0       100.0       100.0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE      COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE   ALL

VARIABLE  QUES 02.  HOW MANY COOPERATING TEACHERS ARE YOU RESPONSIBLE FOR PER TERM?


                                                    ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED     CUMULATIVE
                                                    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                 (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                                    ------------------------------------------------

          1-5 COOPERATING TEACHERS                      6          35.3         35.3         35.3

         6-10 COOPERATING TEACHERS                      7          41.2         41.2         76.4

        11-15 COOPERATING TEACHERS                      2          11.8         11.8         88.2

        16-20 COOPERATING TEACHERS                      2         -11.8-       -11.8-       100.0
                                        TOTAL          17         100.0        100.0        100.0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE     COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE  ALL

VARIABLE QUES 03.  HAVE YOU ANY COURSEWORK, WORKSHOP OR FORMAL TRAINING ON BEING A COORDINATOR?
                   IF YES HOW HELPFUL?

                                                  ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE    ADJUSTED      CUMULATIVE
                                                  FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY     ADJ FREQ
                                                               (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)     (PERCENT)
                                                  ------------------------------------------------

        NO TRAINING                                  11          64.7       MISSING         - -

        YES--EXTREMELY HELPFUL                        3          17.6        50.0          50.0

        YES--SOMEWHAT HELPFUL                         2          11.8        33.3          83.3

        YES--NOT AT ALL HELPFUL                       1           5.9        16.7         100.0
                                    TOTAL            17         100.0       100.0         100.0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE      COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE   ALL

VARIABLE  QUES 04.  WHAT PERCENTAGE OF YOUR TIME IS SPENT ON DUTIES RELATED TO STUDENT TEACHERS AND/OR
                    COOPERATING TEACHERS?

                                                       ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED     CUMULATIVE
                                                       FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                                       ---------------------------------------------------
        0-20% OF TIME                                     6           35.3         35.3         35.3

       20-40% OF TIME                                     6           35.3         35.3         70.6

       40-60% OF TIME                                     2           11.8         11.8         82.3

       60-80% OF TIME                                     1            5.9          5.9         88.2

       80-100% OF TIME                                   _2_         _11.8_       _11.8_        100.0
                                      TOTAL              17          100.0        100.0         100.0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE      COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE   ALL

VARIABLE  QUES 5A.  DO YOU TEACH ANY COURSES AT A COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY?

                                                   ABSOLUTE      RELATIVE     ADJUSTED     CUMULATIVE
                                                   FREQUENCY     FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                 (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                                   ------------------------------------------------------
        YES                                           11           64.7         64.7         64.7

        NO                                             6           35.3         35.3        100.0
                                    TOTAL             17          100.0        100.0        100.0

    QUES 5B.  DO YOU PLAN THE IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS IN
              YOUR SCHOOL RELATED TO STUDENT TEACHING?

        NO ANSWER                                      4           23.5        MISSING        - -

        YES                                            9           53.0         69.2         69.2

        NO                                             4           23.5         30.8        100.0
                                    TOTAL             17          100.0        100.0        100.0

    QUES 5C.  DO YOU IMPLEMENT THE IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS
              IN YOUR SCHOOL RELATED TO STUDENT TEACHING?

        NO ANSWER                                      4           23.5        MISSING        --

        YES                                            9           53.0         69.2         69.2

        NO                                             3           17.6         23.1         92.3

        YES & NO                                       1            5.9          7.7        100.0
                                    TOTAL             17          100.0        100.0        100.0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE      COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE   ALL

VARIABLE  QUES 5D.  DO YOU HOLD SEMINARS FOR STUDENT TEACHERS?


                                               ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED     CUMULATIVE
                                               FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                            (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                               --------------------------------------------------
          NO ANSWER                                3          17.6        MISSING         --

          YES                                     10          58.8         71.4          71.4

          NO                                       4          23.5         28.6         100.0
                                    TOTAL         17         100.0        100.0         100.0

       QUES 5E.  DO YOU HOLD SEMINARS FOR
                 COOPERATING TEACHERS?

          NO ANSWER                                1           5.9        MISSING         --

          YES                                     14          82.3         87.5          87.5

          NO                                       2          11.8         12.5         100.0
                                    TOTAL         17         100.0        100.0         100.0

       QUES 5F.  DO YOU PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAINING
                 NOT RELATED TO STUDENT TEACHING?

          NO ANSWER                                1           5.9        MISSING         --

          YES                                      7          41.2         43.8          43.8

          NO                                       8          47.0         50.0          93.8

          YES & NO                                 1           5.9          6.2         100.0
                                    TOTAL         17         100.0        100.0         100.0
```

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 06. HAVE YOU SUGGESTED CHANGES IN THE TEACHER PREPARATION SYSTEM?
IF YES; WHAT WAS THE RESPONSE?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	1	5.9	MISSING	--
NO SUGGESTIONS MADE	2	11.8	MISSING	--
IGNORED, NO RESPONSE	3	17.6	21.4	64.2
REPLIED TO, NO ACTION	3	17.6	21.4	21.4
RECEPTIVE, FAVORABLE	3	17.6	21.4	42.8
IMPLEMENTED	2	11.8	14.4	78.6
YES--NOT SPECIFIED	3	17.6	21.4	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE   COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 07. WHAT CHANGES IN THE TEACHER PREPARATION SYSTEM, WOULD YOU MAKE IF YOU COULD?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	3	17.6	MISSING	--
NO CHANGES NEEDED, NONE	2	11.8	MISSING	--
EARLIER FIELD EXPERIENCES	7	41.2	58.4	58.4
MORE AUTHORITY FOR COOPERATING TEACHER	1	5.9	8.3	66.7
MORE RESPONSIBILITY FOR COORDINATOR	1	5.9	8.3	75.0
LONGER S.T. UNDER TEAM TEACHING SYSTEM	1	5.9	8.3	83.3
BETTER METHODS COURSES	2	11.8	16.7	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE      COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE   ALL

VARIABLE  QUES 08.  IS YOUR SUPERVISORY WORK PART OF GRADUATE STUDIES OR SOME OTHER PROGRAM
                    FOR WHICH YOU ARE NOT PAID?  IF NO, BY WHOM ARE YOU PAID?

                                               ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                               FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                           (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                               ------------------------------------------------
          YES                                      2         11.8       MISSING        --

          NO-COLLEGE                               9         53.0        60.0         60.0

          NO-SCHOOL DISTRICT                       1          5.9         6.7         66.7

          NO-NO PERCENTAGE INDICATED               2         11.8        13.2         79.9

          NO-25% COLLEGE; 75% SCHOOL DISTRICT      1          5.9         6.7         86.6

          NO-33% COLLEGE; 67% SCHOOL DISTRICT      1          5.9         6.7         93.3

          NO-10% RELEASE TIME                     _1_       __5.9_      __6.7_       100.0
                                  TOTAL           17        100.0       100.0        100.0
```

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 09. DO YOU ASSIGN STUDENT TEACHERS TO COOPERATING TEACHERS? IF NOT WHO DOES?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
YES--ASSIGN STUDENT TEACHERS	8	47.0	47.0	47.0
NO--DIRECTOR LAB EXPERIENCES	5	29.4	29.4	76.4
NO--COOPERATIVELY	1	5.9	5.9	82.3
NO--DEAN	1	5.9	5.9	88.2
NO--COOPERATIVELY WITH TEACHERS	1	5.9	5.9	94.1
NO--ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE      COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE   ALL

VARIABLE  QUES 10.  WERE OTHERS EXPECTATIONS OF YOU MADE CLEAR BEFORE YOU BEGAN?


                                      ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE     ADJUSTED     CUMULATIVE
                                      FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                  (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                      ------------------------------------------------
     NO ANSWER                           2          11.8        MISSING        --

     YES                                10          58.8         66.7         66.7

     NO                                  5          29.4         33.3        100.0
                                       ---         -----        -----        -----
                           TOTAL        17         100.0        100.0        100.0
```

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 11. DO THE COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY AND THE SCHOOL HAVE A MECHANISM FOR COOPERATIVELY DETERMINING GENERAL POLICY? IF YES--HOW USEFUL?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	1	5.9	MISSING	--
NO	4	23.5	MISSING	--
YES--EXTREMELY USEFUL	3	17.6	25.0	25.0
YES--SOMEWHAT USEFUL	9	53.0	75.0	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 12. HOW WERE COOPERATING TEACHERS CHOSEN, AND BY WHOM?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
DIRECTOR	1	5.9	5.9	5.9
COORDINATOR	5	29.4	29.4	35.3
PRINCIPALS & DEANS	2	11.8	11.8	47.0
PRINCIPALS & DEPT. CHAIRMEN	2	11.8	11.8	58.8
VOLUNTEERED	2	11.8	11.8	70.6
ENTIRE STAFF	1	5.9	5.9	76.4
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL	1	5.9	5.9	82.3
COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE, DEAN & DIRECTOR LAB EXPERIENCES	2	11.8	11.8	94.1
OTHER	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE   COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE   ALL

VARIABLE QUES 13. WHICH COLLEGES OR UNIVERSITIES SEND STUDENT TEACHERS TO YOU?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	1	5.9
ST. JOHN	5	29.4
CASE WESTERN RESERVE	5	29.4
CLEVELAND STATE	6	35.3
BALDWIN-WALLACE	1	5.9
JOHN CARROLL	2	11.8
KENT	2	11.8
CENTRAL STATE	1	5.9
BOWLING GREEN	1	5.9
OHIO UNIVERSITY	3	17.6
TOTAL	27*	158.9*

*SUMS TO MORE THAN THE 17 RESPONDENTS OR 100%
BECAUSE OF MULTIPLE MENTIONS.

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 14. WHAT ONE MAJOR THING COULD THE COLLEGES OR UNIVERSITIES DO TO HELP YOU BE MORE EFFECTIVE IN YOUR JOB? .

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	3	17.6
PROVIDE MORE MEANINGFUL IN-SERVICE	4	23.5
PROVIDE MORE INDEPENDENCE	1	5.9
BECOME MORE AWARE OF OUR TIME DEMANDS & SCHEDULES	1	5.9
CONTINUE RELEASE TIME	1	5.9
ALLOW DECISION MAKING TO TAKE PLACE IN CENTER	1	5.9
PROVIDE BETTER METHODS COURSE	1	5.9
WORK WITH COOPERATING TEACHERS	1	5.9
PROVIDE MORE KNOWLEDGE ON STUDENT TEACHING	1	5.9
REACH MORE FORMAL AGREEMENTS BETWEEN UNIVERSITIES AND SYSTEMS INVOLVED	1	5.9
CLOSER LIAISON, IDENTIFY PROSPECTIVE S.T. SOONER	1	5.9
ADJUST CLASS SCHEDULES OF S.T.	2	11.8
TOTAL	18*	106.0*

*SUMS TO MORE THAN THE 17 RESPONDENTS OR 100% BECAUSE OF MULTIPLE MENTIONS.

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE     COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE  ALL

VARIABLE  QUES 15.  WHAT ONE MAJOR THING COULD YOUR SCHOOL DO TO HELP YOU BE MORE EFFECTIVE IN YOUR JOB?


                                                  ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED     CUMULATIVE
                                                  FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                              (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                                  -------------------------------------------------
         NO ANSWER                                    4          23.5      MISSING        --

         PROVIDE MORE TIME TO WORK WITH S.T. &        3          17.6       23.3         23.3
            COOPERATING TEACHERS

         ESTABLISH A SYSTEM-WIDE COMMITMENT TO        1           5.9        7.7         31.0
            TEACHER CENTER CONCEPT

         PROVIDE MORE RELEASE TIME                    4          23.5       30.8         61.7

         CLEARLY DEFINE ROLE OF COORDINATOR           1           5.9        7.7         69.4

         HAVE A DEPARTMENT HEAD                       1           5.9        7.7         77.0

         ESTABLISH SYSTEM-WIDE COORDINATION           1           5.9        7.7         84.7
            FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE & INSERVICE

         MORE INDEPENDENCE                            1           5.9        7.7         92.3

         COULD ASK FOR NO MORE THAN I HAVE NOW       _1_        _5.9_      _7.7_       100.0
                                        TOTAL        17         100.0      100.0        100.0
```

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 16. WHAT ONE MAJOR THING COULD YOU DO TO HELP YOU BE MORE EFFECTIVE ON YOUR JOB?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	3	17.6	MISSING	--
MORE TIME	1	5.9	7.1	7.1
MORE TIME TO SPEND WITH STUDENT TEACHER	3	17.6	21.4	28.5
MORE TIME TO SPEND WITH COOPERATING TEACHER	1	5.9	7.1	35.6
MORE TIME DEVOTED TO THE CENTER	1	5.9	7.1	42.8
MEET WITH OTHER SUPERVISORS & COORDINATORS	1	5.9	7.1	49.9
ACQUIRE GROUP PROCESS SKILLS & SIMULATION TECHNIQUES	1	5.9	7.1	57.1
MORE READING ON EFFECTIVE SUPERVISION	2	11.8	14.3	71.4
ATTEND MORE WORKSHOPS, VISITATIONS TO OTHER CENTERS	1	5.9	7.1	78.6
HAVE A BETTER BACKGROUND IN EDUCATIONAL COURSES	1	5.9	7.1	85.7
PROVIDE BETTER IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS. CONDUCT OWN SEMINARS	1	5.9	7.1	92.9
PROVIDE MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE SCHOOL TO S.T. & HELP THEM GET EXPERIENCES BESIDES CLASSROOM	1	5.9	7.1	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE     COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE  ALL

VARIABLE QUES 17.  WHAT TYPE OF SCHOOL ARE YOU INVOLVED WITH?

                                                   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE     ADJUSTED     CUMULATIVE
                                                   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                               (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                                   -------------------------------------------------
          SUBURBAN                                    13         76.4         76.4          76.4

          URBAN (OTHER THAN INNER CITY)                3         17.7         17.7          94.1

          SUBURBAN & URBAN                             1          5.9          5.9         100.0
                                      TOTAL           17        100.0        100.0         100.0
```

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 18. WHO MAKES THE DECISIONS ABOUT STUDENT TEACHING?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	1	5.9	5.9	5.9
MAINLY BY COLLEGE	6	35.3	35.3	41.2
MAINLY BY SCHOOL PERSONNEL	4	23.5	23.5	64.7
SHARED EQUALLY	6	35.3	35.3	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE     COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE  ALL

VARIABLE QUES 19. DOES YOUR SCHOOL HAVE A JOINT COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY/SCHOOL DISTRICT COMMITTEE?


                                        ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                        FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                    (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                        ---------------------------------------------
      NO ANSWER                             1          5.9       MISSING       --

      YES                                   3         17.7        18.8        18.8

      NO                                   13         76.4        81.2       100.0
                             TOTAL         17        100.0       100.0       100.0
```

APPENDIX B

TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO
THE
COOPERATING TEACHERS SURVEY - SPRING 1972

Conducted By The

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS COORDINATING COMMITTEE

As part of the SITE Project

Funded by a Grant from the

MARTHA HOLDEN JENNINGS FOUNDATION

In March of 1972 the Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee conducted a questionnaire study of student teachers and cooperating teachers from teacher education centers operating in the Greater Cleveland area. Verbatim responses are available in a separate report. This report presents the tabulation of responses from cooperating teachers. Responses from Student Teachers are available in a separate report.

METRO AREA TOTALS

Cleveland Commission on Higher Education
Cleveland, Ohio

April, 1972

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                              24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER     KIRK       PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     JFK        TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS
             ARLING     GILGLE     NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE     VAR001               AWARE BEFORE WOULD HAVE STUDENT TEACHER.

VALUE LABEL                                      VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                          FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                      (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                                 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
WEEK OR LESS                                        2.          8         6.9         7.1          7.1

2-3 WEEKS                                           3.         18        15.5        16.1         23.2

4-5                                                 4.         27        23.3        24.1         47.3

6-7                                                 5.         24        20.7        21.4         68.7

8-9                                                 6.         10         8.6         8.9         77.7

10-11                                               7.          7         6.0         6.3         83.9

OVER 11                                             8.          8         6.9         7.1         91.1

YES - NOT SPECIFIED                                 9.         10         8.6         8.9        100.0

NO ANSWER                                           0.          0          .0     MISSING        100.0

NO                                                  1.          4         3.4     MISSING        100.0
                                                           -------     -------     -------      -------
                                                 TOTAL        116       100.0       100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             5.009

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         112
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           4
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                  24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE       SHAKER     KIRK        PROSPE     MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK         TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
              ARLING     GILGLE      NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE       VAR002             IF TRAINED FOR SUPERVISOR--HOW HELPFUL.

VALUE LABEL                                   VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                      FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                  (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

NO                                              1.        74        63.8        63.8        63.8

YES, EXTREMELY                                  2.        13        11.2        11.2        75.0

YES, SOMEWHAT                                   3.        26        22.4        22.4        97.4

YES, NOT AT ALL                                 4.         3         2.6         2.6       100.0
                                                      -------     -------     -------     -------
                                              TOTAL      116       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              1.638

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                 24 MAY          PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE       SHAKER      KIRK       PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK          TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
              ARLING      GILGLE     NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR003            ASK FOR STUDENT TEACHER.

VALUE LABEL                                 VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                     FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                 (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                            - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                     0.          2          1.7         1.7          1.7

NO                                            1.         80         69.0        69.0         70.7

YES                                           2.         34         29.3        29.3        100.0
                                                    -------     -------     -------      -------
                                            TOTAL       116        100.0       100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            1.276

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                            24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER      KIRK        PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK         TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
             ARLING      GILGLE      NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR004           IF HAD S.T.BEFORE WAS EXPERIENCE HELPFUL

VALUE LABEL                                   VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                       FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                          - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                      0.          1          .9          .9          .9

NO                                             1.         35        30.2        30.2        31.0

YES, EXTREMELY                                 2.         52        44.8        44.8        75.9

YES, SOMEWHAT                                  3.         23        19.8        19.8        95.7

YES, NOT AT ALL                                4.          2         1.7         1.7        97.4

YES, NOT SPECIFIED                             5.          3         2.6         2.6       100.0
                                                       -------     -------     -------     -------
                                             TOTAL       116       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             1.991

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                              24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE     SHAKER      KIRK        PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK        TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
            ARLING      GILGLE      NORDLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR005              HAVE ASSISTANCE DURING TERM.

VALUE LABEL                                   VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                       FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                          - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                      0.          4          3.4          3.4          3.4

YES-COLLEGE OR UNIV.                           1.         59         50.9         50.9         54.3

YES-SCHOOL DISTRICT                            2.          2          1.7          1.7         56.0

YES-BOTH                                       3.         26         22.4         22.4         78.4

NO                                             5.         25         21.6         21.6        100.0
                                                       -------     -------      -------      -------
                                             TOTAL       116        100.0        100.0        100.0
STATISTICS..

MEAN              2.293

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -            0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                  24 MAY       PAGE

FILE     QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE     SHAKER     KIRK        PROSPE    MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK       TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
            ARLING     GILGLE      NOROLM    STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR006            WHAT IS NATURE OF ASSISTANCE.

VALUE LABEL                                  VALUE   ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                     FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                  (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                            - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                      0.        4          3.4          4.5          4.5

SEMINARS,MEETINGS                              1.       10          8.6         11.4         15.9

CENTER COORDINATOR                             2.       17         14.7         19.3         35.2

DIR OF STU TEACHING                            3.       42         36.2         47.7         83.0

TEACHERS                                       4.        2          1.7          2.3         85.2

DEPT SUPERVISOR                                5.        2          1.7          2.3         87.5

NOT HELPFUL                                    6.        2          1.7          2.3         89.8

OTHER                                          7.        9          7.8         10.2        100.0

NO ON PREVIOUS Q.                              8.       25         21.6       MISSING       100.0

YES,NOT SPECIFIED                              9.        3          2.6       MISSING       100.0
                                                     -------      -------      -------      -------
                                             TOTAL     116        100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN          2.989

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -       88
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -       28
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                             24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER      KIRK         PROSPE       MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK          TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
             ARLING      GILGLE       NOROLM       STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR007              HOW KNOWLEDGEABLE IS STUDENT TEACHER.

VALUE LABEL                                         VALUE     ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED     CUMULATIVE
                                                              FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY     ADJ FREQ
                                                                           (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                                    - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                             0.           1           .9           .9           .9

EXTREMELY                                             1.          36         31.0         31.0         31.9

SOMEWHAT                                              2.          61         52.6         52.6         84.5

NEUTRAL                                               3.          14         12.1         12.1         96.6

NOT VERY                                              4.           2          1.7          1.7         98.3

NOT AT ALL                                            5.           2          1.7          1.7        100.0
                                                             -------      -------      -------      -------
                                                    TOTAL        116        100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              1.879

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -            0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                              24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE       SHAKER      KIRK        PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK         TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
              ARLING      GILGLE      NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR008             HOW DOES STUDENT TEACHER RELATE TO KIDS.

VALUE LABEL                                     VALUE   ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                        FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                     (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                                - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

NO ANSWER                                         0.         1           .9           .9           .9

EXTREMELY WELL                                    1.        50         43.1         43.1         44.0

FAIRLY WELL                                       2.        40         34.5         34.5         78.4

NEUTRAL                                           3.        15         12.9         12.9         91.4

NOT VERY WELL                                     4.         6          5.2          5.2         96.6

NOT RELATE AT ALL                                 5.         4          3.4          3.4        100.0
                                                        -------      -------      -------      -------
                                              TOTAL        116        100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              1.888

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                        24 MAY       PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE       SHAKER      KIRK        PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK         TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
              ARLING      GILGLE      NORQLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR009                HOW DOES STUD. TEACH. RELATE TO ADULTS.

VALUE LABEL                                        VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE     ADJUSTED     CUMULATIVE
                                                            FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                        (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                                   - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                            0.          1          .9           .9           .9

EXTREMELY WELL                                       1.         57        49.1         49.1         50.0

FAIRLY WELL                                          2.         40        34.5         34.5         84.5

NEUTRAL                                              3.         14        12.1         12.1         96.6

NOT VERY WELL                                        4.          1          .9           .9         97.4

NOT RELATE AT ALL                                    5.          3         2.6          2.6        100.0
                                                            -------     -------      -------      -------
                                                   TOTAL       116       100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            1.707

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -            0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE     SHAKER      KIRK        PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK         TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
            ARLING      GILGLE      NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR010            HOW MANY STUD. TEACH. RESPONSIBLE FOR.

VALUE LABEL                                  VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                     FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                 (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ONE                                             1.        91        78.4        82.0         82.0

TWO                                             2.        12        10.3        10.8         92.8

THREE                                           3.         2         1.7         1.8         94.6

FOUR                                            4.         3         2.6         2.7         97.3

SIX                                             6.         1          .9          .9         98.2

SEVEN                                           7.         1          .9          .9         99.1

GREATER THAN 7                                  8.         1          .9          .9        100.0

NO ANSWER                                       0.         2         1.7     MISSING        100.0

NONE                                            9.         3         2.6     MISSING        100.0
                                                     -------     -------     -------      -------
                                             TOTAL       116       100.0       100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             1.387

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        111
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          5
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                     24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)    FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER      KIRK        PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK         TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
             ARLING      GILGLE      NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE       VAR011               TRAINING SESSIONS FOR TEACHERS.

VALUE LABEL                                     VALUE     ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                          FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                       (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
YES-COLLEGE                                        3.         17          14.7         77.3         77.3

YES-SCHOOL                                         4.          2           1.7          9.1         86.4

YES-BOTH                                           5.          3           2.6         13.6        100.0

NO ANSWER                                          0.          1            .9      MISSING        100.0

NO                                                 1.         93          80.2      MISSING        100.0
                                                           -------      -------      -------      -------
                                                TOTAL        116         100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             3.364

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         22
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -         94
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER      KIRK       PROSPE    MENTOR     CLEVHT     JFK         TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
             ARLING      GILGLE     NOROLM    STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR012            RESPONSE TO SUGGESTED CHANGES

VALUE LABEL                                    VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE     ADJUSTED     CUMULATIVE
                                                       FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY     ADJ FREQ
                                                                   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                               - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
TOO EARLY TO TELL                                2.          7         6.0         13.5         13.5

IGNORED,NO RESPONSE                              3.         15        12.9         28.8         42.3

NOT IMPLEMENTED                                  4.          8         6.9         15.4         57.7

FAVORABLY RECEIVED                               5.         14        12.1         26.9         84.6

IMPLEMENTED                                      6.          7         6.0         13.5         98.1

OTHER                                            7.          1          .9          1.9        100.0

NO ANSWER                                        0.          3         2.6      MISSING        100.0

NONE SUGGESTED                                   1.         54        46.6      MISSING        100.0

NO RESPONSE STATED                               9.          7         6.0      MISSING        100.0
                                                       -------     -------      -------      -------
                                               TOTAL       116       100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             4.038

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        52
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -        64
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                   24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =  24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE       SHAKER      KIRK       PROSPE    MENTOR     CLEVHT     JFK        TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS
              ARLING      GILGLE     NORQLM    STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR013             WHAT CHANGES DESIRED.

VALUE LABEL                                    VALUE    ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                        FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                     (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                               - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

MORE FLD EXPERIENCES                             1.         34          29.3         41.5         41.5

LONGER STU TEACHING                              2.         15          12.9         18.3         59.8

MORE HELP FROM UNIV                              3.         18          15.5         22.0         81.7

LET SCHOOLS DO MORE                              4.          2           1.7          2.4         84.1

ASSESS SKILLS FIRST                              5.          5           4.3          6.1         90.2

MORE LESSON PLAN TNG                             6.          3           2.6          3.7         93.9

CAREFUL PLACEMENT                                7.          3           2.6          3.7         97.6

LIGHTEN S.T. CLASSES                             8.          2           1.7          2.4        100.0

NO ANSWER                                        0.         26          22.4      MISSING        100.0

OK AS IS                                         9.          8           6.9      MISSING        100.0
                                                         -------      -------      -------      -------
                                               TOTAL       116         100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              2.512

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        82
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -        34
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                    24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER      KIRK        PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK         TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
             ARLING      GILGLE      NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR014              IS STUDENT PREPARED FOR RURAL SCHOOL.

VALUE LABEL                                    VALUE     ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                         FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                     (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                               - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
VERY WELL PREPARED                               1.         24         20.7        24.5        24.5

SOMEWHAT PREPARED                                2,         33         28,4        33,7        58,2

NEUTRAL                                          3.         20         17.2        20.4        78.6

SOMEWHAT UNPREPARED                              4.         12         10,3        12.2        90.8

NOT AT ALL PREPARED                              5.          9          7.8         9.2       100.0

NO ANSWER                                        0,         18         15.5      MISSING      100.0
                                                         -------     -------     -------     -------
                                               TOTAL       116        100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              2,480

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          98
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          18
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
                                                                                24 MAY       PAGE
FILE     QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)    FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE     SHAKER     KIRK       PROSPE      MENTOR     CLEVHT    JFK        TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS
            ARLING     GILGLE     NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR015

VALUE LABEL
                                              VALUE     ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                        FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                    (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
VERY WELL PREPARED                              1.          56        48.3        49.1        49.1

SOMEWHAT PREPARED                               2.          31        26.7        27.2        76.3

NEUTRAL                                         3.          15        12.9        13.2        89.5

SOMEWHAT UNPREPARED                             4.           7         6.0         6.1        95.6

NOT AT ALL PREPARED                             5.           5         4.3         4.4       100.0

NO ANSWER                                       0.           2         1.7      MISSING      100.0
                                                       -------     -------     -------     -------
                                              TOTAL        116       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              1.895

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        114
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          2
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                      24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER      KIRK        PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK          TAYLOR       HAWKEN       BMS
             ARLING      GILGLE      NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR016              IS STUDENT PREPARED FOR URBAN SCHOOL.

VALUE LABEL
                                       VALUE     ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                 FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                             (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                      - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
VERY WELL PREPARED                       1.         39         33.6        36.8        36.8

SOMEWHAT PREPARED                        2.         33         28.4        31.1        67.9

NEUTRAL                                  3.         20         17.2        18.9        86.8

SOMEWHAT UNPREPARED                      4.          8          6.9         7.5        94.3

NOT AT ALL PREPARED                      5.          6          5.2         5.7       100.0

NO ANSWER                                0.         10          8.6      MISSING      100.0
                                                 -------     -------     -------     -------
                                       TOTAL       116        100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              2.142

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         106
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          10
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                               24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE       SHAKER       KIRK       PROSPE     MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK          TAYLOR       HAWKEN      BMS
              ARLING       GILGLE     NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR017            IS STUDENT PREPARED FOR INNER CITY.

VALUE LABEL                                      VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                          FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                      (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                                 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
VERY WELL PREPARED                                 1.        13         11.2        13.1         13.1
SOMEWHAT PREPARED                                  2.        14         12.1        14.1         27.3
NEUTRAL                                            3.        37         31.9        37.4         64.6
SOMEWHAT UNPREPARED                                4.        14         12.1        14.1         78.8
NOT AT ALL PREPARED                                5.        21         18.1        21.2        100.0
NO ANSWER                                          0.        17         14.7      MISSING       100.0
                                                          -------     -------     -------      -------
                                                 TOTAL      116        100.0       100.0        100.0
STATISTICS..

MEAN             3.162

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         99
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -         17
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                              24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE     SHAKER     KIRK       PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     JFK        TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS
            ARLING     GILGLE     NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE     VAR018           EXPECTATIONS OF YOU CLEAR AT START.

VALUE LABEL                                  VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                      FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                  (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                     0.          9          7.8         7.8         7.8

NO                                            1.         28         24.1        24.1        31.9

YES                                           2.         78         67.2        67.2        99.1

BOTH                                          3.          1           .9          .9       100.0
                                                      -------     -------     -------     -------
                                             TOTAL      116        100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            1.612

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                          24 MAY       PAGE

FILE     QUESTI (CREATION DATE =  24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE     SHAKER      KIRK       PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK         TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
            ARLING      GILGLE     NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR019             HOW ARE EXPECTATIONS OF YOU DETERMINED.

VALUE LABEL                                    VALUE    ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                        FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
59                                                                   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                               - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                        0.         4          3.4          3.4          3.4
JOINTLY                                          1.        80         69.0         69.0         72.4
PRIMARILY SCHOOL                                 2.        13         11.2         11.2         83.6
PRIMARILY COLLEGE                                3.        19         16.4         16.4        100.0
                                                        -------      -------      -------      -------
                                               TOTAL      116        100.0        100.0        100.0
STATISTICS..

MEAN            1.405

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY       PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =  24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE        SHAKER      KIRK        PROSPE      MENTOR     CLEVHT    JFK        TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS
               ARLING      GILGLE      NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE       VAR020               HOW ARE YOU COMPENSATED.

VALUE LABEL                                     VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                         FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                     (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                               - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                         0.          3         2.6         2.6          2.6

CASH,STIPEND                                      1.         38        32.8        32.8         35.3

LESS THAN $50                                     2.          3         2.6         2.6         37.9

NOT COMPENSATED                                   3.          6         5.2         5.2         43.1

$50 OR MORE                                       4.         24        20.7        20.7         63.8

FREE COURSES                                      6.         29        25.0        25.0         88.8

COURSES AND STIPEND                               7.          2         1.7         1.7         90.5

OTHER                                             8.          3         2.6         2.6         93.1

DONT KNOW                                         9.          8         6.9         6.9        100.0
                                                         -------     -------     -------      -------
                                               TOTAL        116       100.0       100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            3.810

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                        24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE       SHAKER     KIRK       PROSPE    MENTOR     CLEVHT     JFK          TAYLOR     HAWKEN      BMS
              ARLING     GILGLE     NOROLM    STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR021               HOW WELL WAS STUD. PREPARED AT START.

VALUE LABEL                                   VALUE   ABSOLUTE   RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                      FREQUENCY  FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                 (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
VERY WELL PREPARED                               1.       46        39.7         40.0         40.0

SOMEWHAT PREPARED                                2.       27        23.3         23.5         63.5

NEUTRAL                                          3.       26        22.4         22.6         86.1

SOMEWHAT UNPREPARED                              4.       10         8.6          8.7         94.8

NOT AT ALL PREPARED                              5.        6         5.2          5.2        100.0

NO ANSWER                                        0.        1          .9      MISSING        100.0
                                                      -------    -------      -------      -------
                                             TOTAL       116       100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN               2.157

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         115
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           1
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                        24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER     KIRK       PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     JFK          TAYLOR      HAWKEN       BMS
             ARLING     GILGLE     NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE       VAR022              PERCENT OF TIME SPENT TEACHING

VALUE LABEL                                VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                               (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                           - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                    0.       11          9.5         9.5         9.5
90-100%                                      1.        5          4.3         4.3        13.8
80-89%                                       2.       10          8.6         8.6        22.4
70-79%                                       3.       20         17.2        17.2        39.7
60-69%                                       4.       17         14.7        14.7        54.3
50-59%                                       5.       18         15.5        15.5        69.8
40-49%                                       6.        7          6.0         6.0        75.9
30-39%                                       7.        5          4.3         4.3        80.2
BELOW 30%                                    8.       13         11.2        11.2        91.4
VARIES                                       9.       10          8.6         8.6       100.0
                                                   -------     -------     -------     -------
                                           TOTAL     116        100.0       100.0       100.0
STATISTICS..

MEAN            4.431

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                        24 MAY      PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =  24 MAY)  FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER    KIRK      PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     JFK      TAYLOR    HAWKEN    BMS
             ARLING    GILGLE    NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE     VAR023            PERCENT TIME SPENT WITH STUDENT TEACHER

VALUE LABEL                                VALUE   ABSOLUTE   RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                   FREQUENCY  FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                              (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                           - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                    0.       11         9.5         9.5          9.5

71-100%                                      1.        3         2.6         2.6         12.1

61-70%                                       2.        1          .9          .9         12.9

51-60%                                       3.        5         4.3         4.3         17.2

41-50%                                       4.        2         1.7         1.7         19.0

31-40%                                       5.       12        10.3        10.3         29.3

21-30%                                       6.       17        14.7        14.7         44.0

11-20%                                       7.       33        28.4        28.4         72.4

0-10%                                        8.       19        16.4        16.4         88.8

VARIES                                       9.       13        11.2        11.2        100.0
                                                   -------    -------     -------     -------
                                           TOTAL     116       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              5.948

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                  24 MAY        PAGE

FILE     QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER     KIRK       PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     JFK        TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS
             ARLING     GILGLE     NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR024           PERCENT TIME ON OTHER DUTIES

VALUE LABEL                                   VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                       FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                        0.       11          9.5         9.5          9.5

51-60%                                           3.        3          2.6         2.6         12.1

41-50%                                           4.        4          3.4         3.4         15.5

31-40%                                           5.        5          4.3         4.3         19.8

21-30%                                           6.       19         16.4        16.4         36.2

11-20%                                           7.       27         23.3        23.3         59.5

0-10%                                            8.       33         28.4        28.4         87.9

VARIES                                           9.       14         12.1        12.1        100.0
                                                       -------     -------     -------     -------
                                             TOTAL      116        100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN                 6.405

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                 24 MAY       PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER      KIRK       PROSPE      MENTOR     CLEVHT     JFK       TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
             ARLING      GILGLE     NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE     VAR025             HOW MANY YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE.

VALUE LABEL                                     VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                         FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                     (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                         0.          1          .9           .9           .9

LESS THAN YEAR                                    2.          2         1.7          1.7          2.6

1 YEAR                                            3.          3         2.6          2.6          5.2

2-3 YEARS                                         4.         12        10.3         10.3         15.5

4-5 YEARS                                         5.         22        19.0         19.0         34.5

6-10 YEARS                                        6.         40        34.5         34.5         69.0

11-15 YEARS                                       7.         22        19.0         19.0         87.9

16-20 YEARS                                       8.          7         6.0          6.0         94.0

MORE THAN 20 YEARS                                9.          7         6.0          6.0        100.0
                                                          -------     -------      -------      -------
                                              TOTAL         116       100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              5.897

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                      24 MAY        PAGE

FILE     QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE     SHAKER     KIRK       PROSPE      MENTOR     CLEVHT     JFK        TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS
            ARLING     GILGLE     NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE     VAR026          YEARS WORKED WITH STUDENT TEACHERS

VALUE LABEL                                    VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                       FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                        0.        4          3.4         3.4         3.4

ZERO                                             1.       19         16.4        16.4        19.8

LESS THAN YEAR                                   2.        8          6.9         6.9        26.7

1 YEAR                                           3.       16         13.8        13.8        40.5

2-3 YEARS                                        4.       34         29.3        29.3        69.8

4-5 YEARS                                        5.       20         17.2        17.2        87.1

6-10 YEARS                                       6.       11          9.5         9.5        96.6

11-15 YEARS                                      7.        3          2.6         2.6        99.1

16-20 YEARS                                      8.        1           .9          .9       100.0
                                                       -------     -------     -------     -------
                                               TOTAL     116        100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              3.569

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                    24 MAY        PAGE

FILE     QUESTI (CREATION DATE =  24 MAY)  FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE     SHAKER    KIRK      PROSPE     MENTOR    CLEVHT     JFK         TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS
            ARLING    GILGLE    NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE     VAR027          HOW MANY STUDENTS WORKED WITH.

VALUE LABEL                                 VALUE   ABSOLUTE   RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                    FREQUENCY  FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                               (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                            - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                     0.        1          .9          .9          .9

NO STUDENT TEACHERS                           1.       11         9.5         9.5        10.3

1 STUDENT TEACHER                             2.       17        14.7        14.7        25.0

2-3                                           3.       30        25.9        25.9        50.9

4-5                                           4.       24        20.7        20.7        71.6

6-10                                          5.       22        19.0        19.0        90.5

11-15                                         6.        7         6.0         6.0        96.6

16-20                                         7.        1          .9          .9        97.4

21-49                                         8.        2         1.7         1.7        99.1

OVER 49                                       9.        1          .9          .9       100.0
                                                    -------     -------     -------     -------
                                            TOTAL     116       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            3.578

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                            24 MAY       PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER     KIRK        PROSPE      MENTOR     CLEVHT     JFK        TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS
             ARLING     GILGLE      NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR028            HOW HAS EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY CHANGED.

VALUE LABEL                                   VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                      FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                  (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                      0.        19         16.4        16.4         16.4

NONE,NOT MUCH                                  1.        53         45.7        45.7         62.1

SLIGHTLY,SOME                                  2.         6          5.2         5.2         67.2

YES,UNSPECIFIED                                3.         2          1.7         1.7         69.0

BY WORK WITH S.T.                              4.        10          8.6         8.6         77.6

BROADENED                                      5.        14         12.1        12.1         89.7

REALIZE POOR ED CRS                            6.         3          2.6         2.6         92.2

MISPLACED TEACHERS                             7.         1           .9          .9         93.1

OTHER                                          9.         8          6.9         6.9        100.0
                                                      -------     -------     -------      -------
                                             TOTAL      116        100.0       100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              2.397

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
                                                                                        24 MAY       PAGE
FILE       QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE       SHAKER      KIRK        PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK         TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
              ARLING      GILGLE      NORQLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR029              HAVE SET SCHEDULE OF EXPERIENCES FOR ST.

VALUE LABEL                                      VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                          FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                      (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                                 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                          0.          3         2.6         2.6          2.6

NO                                                 1.         46        39.7        39.7         42.2

YES                                                2.         60        51.7        51.7         94.0

VARIES WITH STUDENT                                3.          7         6.0         6.0        100.0
                                                          -------     -------     -------      -------
                                                 TOTAL       116       100.0       100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN           1.612

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                              24 MAY       PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER    KIRK      PROSPE      MENTOR     CLEVHT     JFK       TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS
             ARLING    GILGLE    NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR030             WHAT ARE YOU NOT PREPARED FOR,

VALUE LABEL                                      VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                         FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                     (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                                 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                          0.        36        31.0        31.0        31.0
NONE                                               1.        24        20.7        20.7        51.7
PHYS,EMOTION PROB                                  2.         3         2.6         2.6        54.3
SEMINARS,UNIV.                                     3.         5         4.3         4.3        58.6
EVALUATION                                         4.         7         6.0         6.0        64.7
DISCIPLINE                                         5.         4         3.4         3.4        68.1
UNQUALIFIED S.T.-S                                 6.        11         9.5         9.5        77.6
INNOVATION                                         7.         4         3.4         3.4        81.0
ADVISING                                           8.        10         8.6         8.6        89.7
OTHER                                              9.        12        10.3        10.3       100.0
                                                          -------     -------     -------     -------
                                                 TOTAL      116       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN           3.233

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                 24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =    24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER      KIRK        PROSPE     MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK        TAYLOR     HAWKEN      BMS
             ARLING      GILGLE      NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR031              MOST EFFECTIVE CONTRIB. OF UNIV..

VALUE LABEL                                     VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                         FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                     (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER,DONT KNOW                               0.         35        30.2        30.2         30.2

TRAINING FOR COOP T.                              1.         31        26.7        26.7         56.9

FREE TUITION                                      2.          3         2.6         2.6         59.5

GRADUATE CREDIT                                   3.          4         3.4         3.4         62.9

BETTER PRE S.T EXP                                4.         11         9.5         9.5         72.4

IN-SERVICE                                        5.         12        10.3        10.3         82.8

PLANNING HELP                                     6.          7         6.0         6.0         88.8

PHIL OF ED FOR S.T.                               7.          2         1.7         1.7         90.5

PREPARE FOR DUTIES                                8.          3         2.6         2.6         93.1

OTHER                                             9.          8         6.9         6.9        100.0
                                                          -------     -------     -------      -------
                                                TOTAL       116       100.0       100.0        100.0
STATISTICS..

MEAN             2.629

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -            0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                              24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)  FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER      KIRK        PROSPE      MENTOR     CLEVHT     JFK         TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
             ARLING      GILGLE      NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR032             AGE

VALUE LABEL                                  VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                      FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                  (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                     0.         6          5.2         5.2         5.2

20-24 YEARS OLD                               1.        14         12.1        12.1        17.2

25-29                                         2.        37         31.9        31.9        49.1

30-34                                         3.        23         19.8        19.8        69.0

35-39                                         4.        10          8.6         8.6        77.6

40-44                                         5.        10          8.6         8.6        86.2

45-49                                         6.         7          6.0         6.0        92.2

50-54                                         7.         8          6.9         6.9        99.1

OVER54                                        8.         1           .9          .9       100.0
                                                      -------     -------     -------     -------
                                             TOTAL     116        100.0       100.0       100.0
STATISTICS..

MEAN             3.043

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                           24 MAY        PAGE

FILE       QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE        SHAKER      KIRK        PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT     JFK          TAYLOR     HAWKEN      BMS
               ARLING      GILGLE      NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE       VAR033                TYPE OF SCHOOLS ATTENDED

VALUE LABEL                                        VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                            FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                        (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                               - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                             0.         2          1.7         1.7         1.7
RURAL                                                 1.        12         10.3        10.3        12.1
SUBURBAN                                              2.        45         38.8        38.8        50.9
URBAN                                                 3.        39         33.6        33.6        84.5
INNER CITY                                            4.         3          2.6         2.6        87.1
URBAN&SUBURBAN                                        5.        11          9.5         9.5        96.6
INNER CITY&SUBURBAN                                   6.         3          2.6         2.6        99.1
INNER CITY&URBAN                                      7.         1           .9          .9       100.0
                                                            -------     -------     -------     -------
                                                   TOTAL       116        100.0       100.0       100.0
STATISTICS..

MEAN               2.681

VALID   OBSERVATIONS =          116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS =            0
```

73

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                              24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER      KIRK        PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK         TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
             ARLING      GILGLE      NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR034            KIND OF SCHOOL ATTENDED

VALUE LABEL                                      VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                          FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                      (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                          0.          3         2.6          2.6          2.6

PUBLIC                                             1.         57        49.1         49.1         51.7

PRIVATE,PAROCHIAL                                  2.         47        40.5         40.5         92.2

BOTH                                               3.          9         7.8          7.8        100.0
                                                          -------     -------      -------      -------
                                                 TOTAL       116       100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              1.534

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                               24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER      KIRK        PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK         TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
             ARLING      GILGLE      NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR035               KIND OF SCHOOL TEACHING IN

VALUE LABEL                                         VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                           FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                       (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                                  - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                             0.          2         1.7         1.7         1.7

SUBURBAN                                              2.         86        74.1        74.1        75.9

URBAN                                                 3.         23        19.8        19.8        95.7

INNER CITY                                            4.          2         1.7         1.7        97.4

URBAN&SUBURBAN                                        5.          2         1.7         1.7        99.1

INNER CITY&URBAN                                      7.          1          .9          .9       100.0
                                                            -------     -------     -------     -------
                                                    TOTAL       116       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              2.293

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                         24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER     KIRK       PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     JFK        TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS
             ARLING     GILGLE     NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE     VAR036            IS SCHOOL PUBLIC.

VALUE LABEL                                   VALUE   ABSOLUTE   RELATIVE   ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                      FREQUENCY  FREQUENCY  FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                 (PERCENT)  (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                       0.        3        2.6        2.6         2.6

PUBLIC                                          1.       75       64.7       64.7        67.2

PRIVATE,PAROCHIAL                               2.       37       31.9       31.9        99.1

                                                4.        1         .9         .9       100.0
                                                      -------    -------    -------     -------
                                              TOTAL     116      100.0      100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             1.319

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                             24 MAY       PAGE

FILE     QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE       SHAKER     KIRK        PROSPE      MENTOR     CLEVHT     JFK         TAYLOR     HAWKEN      BMS
              ARLING     GILGLE      NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR037                 ENROLLMENT

VALUE LABEL                                      VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                          FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                      (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                                 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                          0.         4          3.4         3.4          3.4

LESS THAN 250                                      1.         4          3.4         3.4          6.9

251-500                                            2.        21         18.1        18.1         25.0

501-750                                            3.        35         30.2        30.2         55.2

751-1000                                           4.        17         14.7        14.7         69.8

1001-1500                                          5.        14         12.1        12.1         81.9

1501-2000                                          6.         6          5.2         5.2         87.1

OVER 2000                                          7.        15         12.9        12.9        100.0
                                                          -------     -------     -------      -------
                                                 TOTAL      116        100.0       100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             3.707

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                            24 MAY       PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =  24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE       SHAKER      KIRK        PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      JFK          TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS
              ARLING      GILGLE      NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR038             COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY - UNDERGRADUATE

VALUE LABEL                                  VALUE   ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                     FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                  (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                     0.        14          12.1         12.1         12.1

BALDWIN-WALLACE                               1.         3           2.6          2.6         14.7

CASE WESTERN RESERVE                          2.         7           6.0          6.0         20.7

CLEVELAND STATE                               3.         9           7.8          7.8         28.4

JOHN CARROLL                                  5.         5           4.3          4.3         32.8

ST. JOHN COLLEGE                              7.        24          20.7         20.7         53.4

OTHER                                         9.        54          46.6         46.6        100.0
                                                     -------      -------      -------      -------
                                             TOTAL     116         100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             6.233

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)  FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE     SHAKER      KIRK        PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT      JFK        TAYLOR     HAWKEN      BMS
            ARLING      GILGLE      NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      VAR039              COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY - GRADUATE

VALUE LABEL                                 VALUE    ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                     FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                  (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                           - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                     0.        37          31.9        31.9         31.9

BALDWIN-WALLACE                               1.         1            .9          .9         32.8

CASE WESTERN RESERVE                          2.         9           7.8         7.8         40.5

CLEVELAND STATE                               3.        10           8.6         8.6         49.1

JOHN CARROLL                                  5.         8           6.9         6.9         56.0

ST. JOHN COLLEGE                              7.        16          13.8        13.8         69.8

OTHER                                         9.        35          30.2        30.2        100.0
                                                     -------      -------     -------      -------
                                            TOTAL      116         100.0       100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              4.448

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                      24 MAY      PAGE

FILE      QUESTI (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE      SHAKER     KIRK      PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     JFK        TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS
             ARLING     GILGLE    NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE     VAR040           LEVEL OF STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

VALUE LABEL                              VALUE    ABSOLUTE   RELATIVE   ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                  FREQUENCY  FREQUENCY  FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                             (PERCENT)  (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                         - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                 0.         4         3.4        3.4         3.4

GRADES K-3                                1.        38        32.8       32.8        36.2

4-6                                       2.        18        15.5       15.5        51.7

7-9                                       3.        15        12.9       12.9        64.7

10-12                                     4.        18        15.5       15.5        80.2

K-6                                       5.         8         6.9        6.9        87.1

7-12                                      6.         8         6.9        6.9        94.0

1-12                                      7.         6         5.2        5.2        99.1

OTHER                                     8.         1          .9         .9       100.0
                                                  -------    -------    -------    -------
                                         TOTAL      116       100.0      100.0      100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              2.836

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -       116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -         0
```

APPENDIX C

TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO
THE
STUDENT TEACHERS SURVEY - SPRING 1972

Conducted By The

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS COORDINATING COMMITTEE

As part of the SITE Project

Funded by a Grant from the

MARTHA HOLDEN JENNINGS FOUNDATION

In March of 1972 the Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee conducted a questionnaire study of student teachers and cooperating teachers from teacher education centers operating in the Greater Cleveland area. Verbatim responses are available in a separate report. This report presents the tabulation of responses from student teachers. Responses from cooperating teachers are available in a separate report.

METRO AREA TOTALS

Cleveland Commission on Higher Education
Cleveland, Ohio

April, 1972

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                   24 MAY      PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS      SOUTH      ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES001           HOW YOU FELT ABOUT S.T. EXPERIENCE.

VALUE LABEL                                    VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                       FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                        0.         2         2.1          2.1          2.1

DEFINITELY DISLIKED                              1.         1         1.1          1.1          3.2

DISLIKED--SOMEWHAT                               2.         1         1.1          1.1          4.3

NEUTRAL                                          3.         4         4.3          4.3          8.5

LIKED--SOMEWHAT                                  4.        24        25.5         25.5         34.0

DEFINITELY LIKED                                 5.        62        66.0         66.0        100.0
                                                       -------     -------      -------      -------
                                               TOTAL       94       100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN               4.479

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -         0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                      24 MAY       PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS      SOUTH      ARLIN
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES002          WHAT YOU PARTICULARLY LIKED ABOUT S.T.

VALUE LABEL                              VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                  FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                              (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                         - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                  0.          2         2.1         2.1         2.1

ALL OF IT                                  1.          2         2.1         2.1         4.3

STUDENTS                                   2.         16        17.0        17.0        21.3

CO-OPERATING TEACHER                       3.         35        37.2        37.2        58.5

WORK IN OPEN-SCHOOL                        4.          4         4.3         4.3        62.8

TEAM TEACHING                              5.          7         7.4         7.4        70.2

LEARN BY DOING                             6.          5         5.3         5.3        75.5

OBSERVING, TAPING                          7.          3         3.2         3.2        78.7

FREEDOM, CREATIVITY                        8.         16        17.0        17.0        95.7

OTHER                                      9.          4         4.3         4.3       100.0
                                                   -------     -------     -------     -------
                                         TOTAL        94       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              4.309

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                         24 MAY       PAGE

FILE       STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE       SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH       ARLIN(
              NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES003            WHAT YOU PARTICULARLY DISLIKED ABOUT S.T

VALUE LABEL                                VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                               (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                           - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                   0.        13         13.8        13.8        13.8

NOTHING                                     1.         7          7.4         7.4        21.3

DETAILED LESSON PLAN                        2.        13         13.8        13.8        35.1

DISIPLN, STU ATITUDE                        3.         9          9.6         9.6        44.7

METHOD,SEMNAR,OBSERV                        4.        11         11.7        11.7        56.4

SCHEDULE, TIME PROB.                        5.         8          8.5         8.5        64.9

NOT ENOUGH GUIDANCE                         6.         9          9.6         9.6        74.5

NOT ENOUGH FREEDOM                          7.         5          5.3         5.3        79.8

NOT ACCEPTED                                8.         8          8.5         8.5        88.3

OTHER                                       9.        11         11.7        11.7       100.0
                                                   -------     -------     -------     -------
                                           TOTAL      94        100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            4.213

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -         0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY       PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE     SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR    CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS        SOUTH       ARLING
            NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE     QUES004          DID YOU ATTEND SEMINARS HELD BY COLLEGE.

VALUE LABEL                                  VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                     FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                 (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
YES                                             1.        93        98.9        98.9        98.9

NO                                              2.         1         1.1         1.1       100.0
                                                     -------     -------     -------     -------
                                             TOTAL        94       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              1.011

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                         24 MAY       PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =  24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS       SOUTH       ARLING
             NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES04A           WHERE WERE SEMINARS HELD.

VALUE LABEL                                  VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                      FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                  (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
       86                                    - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
S.T. SITE                                      2.         32         34.0        34.4        34.4

COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY                            3.         31         33.0        33.3        67.7

BOTH                                           4.         10         10.6        10.8        78.5

OTHER--PROFS HOME                              6.          6          6.4         6.5        84.9

OTHER--AREA SCHOOL                             7.         13         13.8        14.0        98.9

OTHER--COLLEGE, ETC.                           8.          1          1.1         1.1       100.0

NO ANS--QUES.4 IS NO                           0.          1          1.1     MISSING       100.0

ANSWER NOT SPECIFIED                           1.          0           .0     MISSING       100.0
                                                      -------     -------     -------     -------
                                             TOTAL        94        100.0       100.0       100.0
STATISTICS..

MEAN              3.570

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         93
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          1
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                    24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE       SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH       ARLING
              NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES04B            WHO CONDUCTED THE SEMINARS.

VALUE LABEL                                 VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                     FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                 (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                           - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
COLLEGE PERSON                                2.        72          76.6        77.4        77.4

SCHOOL PERSON                                 3.        15          16.0        16.1        93.5

BOTH                                          4.         4           4.3         4.3        97.8

BOTH, SPEC. SPEAKERS                          6.         2           2.1         2.2       100.0

NO ANS--QUES.4 IS NO                          0.         1           1.1      MISSING      100.0

ANSWER NOT SPECIFIED                          1.         0            .0      MISSING      100.0
                                                     -------     -------     -------     -------
                                           TOTAL        94         100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              2.333

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          93
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           1
```

87

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                     24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR     CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH        ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE       QUES04C             ABLE TO SHARE EXPERIENCES WITH S.T.

VALUE LABEL                                     VALUE     ABSOLUTE      RELATIVE      ADJUSTED     CUMULATIVE
                                                          FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY     FREQUENCY      ADJ FREQ
 88                                                                    (PERCENT)     (PERCENT)     (PERCENT)
                                                - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
SHARE HEAVILY                                      2.          21          22.3          22.6          22.6

SHARE MODERATELY                                   3.          47          50.0          50.5          73.1

SHARE NOT AT ALL                                   4.          25          26.6          26.9         100.0

NO ANS--QUES.4 IS NO                               0.           1           1.1       MISSING         100.0

ANSWER NOT SPECIFIED                               1.           0            .0       MISSING         100.0
                                                          -------       -------       -------       -------
                                                TOTAL          94         100.0         100.0         100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN               3.043

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         93
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          1
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                       24 MAY       PAGE

FILE     STUDEN (CREATION DATE =  24 MAY)  TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE     SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS       SOUTH       ARLING
            NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES04D            HOW USEFUL WERE SEMINARS.

VALUE LABEL                                  VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                     FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                 (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
```

89

```
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
EXTREMELY USEFUL                               2.        6          6.4         6.5         6.5

SOMEWHAT USEFUL                                3.       56         59.6        60.2        66.7

NOT AT ALL USEFUL                              4.       31         33.0        33.3       100.0

NO ANS--QUES.4 IS NO                           0.        1          1.1      MISSING      100.0

ANSWER NOT SPECIFIED                           1.        0           .0      MISSING      100.0
                                                     -------     -------     -------     -------
                                             TOTAL      94        100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              3.269

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          93
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           1
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                        24 MAY      PAGE

FILE     STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE     MENTOR    CLEVHT     TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS        SOUTH      ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE       QUES05A            HOW HELPFUL IS YOUR COOPERATING TEACHER.

VALUE LABEL                                 VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                    FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                            - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
EXTREMELY HELPFUL                             1.        68        72.3        72.3         72.3

SOMEWHAT HELPFUL                              2.        15        16.0        16.0         88.3

NEUTRAL                                       3.         7         7.4         7.4         95.7

NOT VERY HELPFUL                              4.         3         3.2         3.2         98.9

NOT AT ALL HELPFUL                            5.         1         1.1         1.1        100.0
                                                    -------     -------     -------     -------
                                            TOTAL       94       100.0       100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              1.447

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                              24 MAY       PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS        SOUTH      ARLINC
             NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE     QUES05B           HOW COMPETENT COOP TEACHER IN TEACHING.

VALUE LABEL                                    VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                       FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                        0.          1         1.1         1.1         1.1

EXTREMELY COMPETENT                              1.         71        75.5        75.5        76.6

SOMEWHAT COMPETENT                               2.         12        12.8        12.8        89.4

NEUTRAL                                          3.          8         8.5         8.5        97.9

NOT VERY COMPETENT                               4.          1         1.1         1.1        98.9

NOT AT ALL COMPETENT                             5.          1         1.1         1.1       100.0
                                                       -------     -------     -------     -------
                                               TOTAL        94       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            1.362

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY        PAGE

FILE     STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)    TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE     SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH       ARLING
            NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE       QUES05C              HOW COMPETENT COOP TEACHER WITH YOU.

VALUE LABEL                                    VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                       FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                               - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

EXTREMELY COMPETENT                             1.         65        69.1        69.1        69.1

SOMEWHAT COMPETENT                              2.         17        18.1        18.1        87.2

NEUTRAL                                         3.          8         8.5         8.5        95.7

NOT VERY COMPETENT                              4.          1         1.1         1.1        96.8

NOT AT ALL COMPETENT                            5.          3         3.2         3.2       100.0
                                                       -------     -------     -------     -------
                                               TOTAL       94       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            1.511

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                             24 MAY        PAGE

FILE     STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE    SHAKER    PROSPE    MENTOR    CLEVHT    TAYLOR    HAWKEN    BMS       SOUTH     ARLING
           NOROLM    STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES006         WHO EVALUATES YOUR WORK AS S.T.

VALUE LABEL                                   VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                      FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                  (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
COLLEGE PERSON                                 1.        10         10.6        10.6        10.6

SCHOOL PERSON                                  2.        29         30.9        30.9        41.5

BOTH                                           3.        52         55.3        55.3        96.8

OTHER--TEACHING TEAM                           4.         3          3.2         3.2       100.0
                                                      -------     -------     -------     -------
                                              TOTAL      94        100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN               2.511

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER       PROSPE       MENTOR       CLEVHT       TAYLOR       HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH        ARLING
             NOROLM       STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES007            HOW MANY REGULAR TEACHERS HELP YOU.

VALUE LABEL                                     VALUE    ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                         FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                      (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

NO ANSWER                                         0.          1          1.1          1.1          1.1

ONE TEACHER                                       1.         40         42.6         42.6         43.6

TWO TEACHERS                                      2.         31         33.0         33.0         76.6

THREE TEACHERS                                    3.         16         17.0         17.0         93.6

MORE THAN 3 TEACHERS                              4.          6          6.4          6.4        100.0
                                                          -------      -------      -------      -------
                                               TOTAL         94        100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN               1.851

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                              24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE     SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR     CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN     BMS         SOUTH       ARLING
            NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES08A           OTHERS EXPECTATIONS CLEAR BEFORE S.T.

VALUE LABEL                                   VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                       FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                        0.          2         2.1          2.1          2.1

YES                                              1.         67        71.3         71.3         73.4

NO                                               2.         25        26.6         26.6        100.0
                                                       -------     -------      -------      -------
                                              TOTAL         94       100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            1.245

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                               24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH       ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE        QUES08B             OTHERS EXPECTATIONS CLEAR NOW.

VALUE LABEL                                      VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                          FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                      (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                                 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

NO ANSWER                                          0.          11        11.7        11.7         11.7

YES                                                1.          74        78.7        78.7         90.4

NO                                                 2.           9         9.6         9.6        100.0
                                                           -------     -------     -------      -------
                                                 TOTAL         94       100.0       100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN                  .979

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                       24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE       SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH       ARLING
              NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES009            UNFAIRLY USED FOR YOUR SERVICES.

VALUE LABEL                                      VALUE    ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                          FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                       (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                                 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

NO ANSWER                                          0.         1           1.1          1.1          1.1

YES                                                1.        15          16.0         16.0         17.0

NO                                                 2.        78          83.0         83.0        100.0
                                                          -------      -------      -------      -------
                                                 TOTAL       94         100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            1.819

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY       PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR     CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS        SOUTH       ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE       QUES010          HOW MUCH RESPONSIBILITY DO YOU HAVE.

VALUE LABEL                                          VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                             FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                         (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                                  - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
TOO MUCH                                               1.          2         2.1          2.1          2.1

ABOUT RIGHT                                            2.         87        92.6         92.6         94.7

TOO LITTLE                                             3.          5         5.3          5.3        100.0
                                                             -------     -------      -------      -------
                                                     TOTAL        94       100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              2.032

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

98

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                              24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH       ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES011          HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT S.T. EXPERIENCE.

VALUE LABEL                                  VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                      FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                  (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                      0.          3         3.2          3.2          3.2

NOT QUITE FLUNKY                               2.          2         2.1          2.1          5.3

NEUTRAL                                        3.          7         7.4          7.4         12.8

NOT QUITE A TEACHER                            4.         31        33.0         33.0         45.7

ESTABLISHED TEACHER                            5.         51        54.3         54.3        100.0
                                                     -------     -------      -------      -------
                                             TOTAL        94       100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             4.298

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                         24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS         SOUTH      ARLING
             NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES012          SUGGESTED CHANGES IN S.T. SYSTEM.

VALUE LABEL                                VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                               (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                           - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
TOO EARLY TO TELL                            2.        3          3.2         7.1         7.1

IGNORED, NO RESPONSE                         3.        5          5.3        11.9        19.0

REPLIED TO,NO ACTION                         4.        5          5.3        11.9        31.0

RECEPTIVE, FAVORABLE                         5.        7          7.4        16.7        47.6

IMPLEMENTED                                  6.        5          5.3        11.9        59.5

YES--NOT SPECIFIED                           9.       17         18.1        40.5       100.0

NO ANSWER                                    0.        3          3.2       MISSING     100.0

NO SUGGESTIONS MADE                          1.       49         52.1       MISSING     100.0
                                                   -------     -------     -------     -------
                                           TOTAL      94        100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             6.167

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         42
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -         52
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                    24 MAY        PAGE   2

FILE       STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE       SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS        SOUTH      ARLING
              NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES13A          HOW PREPARED TO TEACH IN RURAL SCHOOL.

VALUE LABEL                                VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                    FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                           - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
VERY WELL PREPARED                           1.         32        34.0        34.0         34.0

SOMEWHAT PREPARED                            2.         30        31.9        31.9         66.0

NEUTRAL                                      3.         22        23.4        23.4         89.4

NOT VERY PREPARED                            4.          6         6.4         6.4         95.7

NOT AT ALL PREPARED                          5.          4         4.3         4.3        100.0
                                                    -------     -------     -------      -------
                                           TOTAL        94       100.0       100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             2.149

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -         0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY        PAGE

FILE     STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE     SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS        SOUTH      ARLING
            NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES13B           HOW PREPARED TO TEACH IN SUBURBAN SCHOOL

VALUE LABEL                                   VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                       FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
VERY WELL PREPARED                               1.          68        72.3        72.3        72.3

SOMEWHAT PREPARED                                2.          19        20.2        20.2        92.6

NEUTRAL                                          3.           6         6.4         6.4        98.9

NOT VERY PREPARED                                4.           1         1.1         1.1       100.0
                                                       -------     -------     -------     -------
                                              TOTAL          94       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             1.362

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH       ARLIN
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES13C            HOW PREPARED TO TEACH IN URBAN SCHOOL.

VALUE LABEL                                   VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                      FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                  (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

VERY WELL PREPARED                              1.         47        50.0        50.0        50.0

SOMEWHAT PREPARED                               2.         29        30.9        30.9        80.9

NEUTRAL                                         3.         12        12.8        12.8        93.6

NOT VERY PREPARED                               4.          3         3.2         3.2        96.8

NOT AT ALL PREPARED                             5.          3         3.2         3.2       100.0
                                                      -------     -------     -------     -------
                                              TOTAL        94       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            1.787

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                   24 MAY          PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE       SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH       ARLING
              NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES13D          HOW PREPARED TO TEACH IN INNER CITY.

VALUE LABEL                                      VALUE    ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                          FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                       (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                                 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
VERY WELL PREPARED                                 1.          8          8.5          8.5          8.5

SOMEWHAT PREPARED                                  2.         30         31.9         31.9         40.4

NEUTRAL                                            3.         17         18.1         18.1         58.5

NOT VERY PREPARED                                  4.         16         17.0         17.0         75.5

NOT AT ALL PREPARED                                5.         23         24.5         24.5        100.0
                                                          -------      -------      -------      -------
                                                 TOTAL        94        100.0        100.0        100.0

TATISTICS..

EAN             3.170

ALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
ISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                         24 MAY       PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT      TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS        SOUTH      ARLING
             NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES014            LIKE KIDS MORE OR LESS THAN BEFORE S.T.

VALUE LABEL                                 VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                     FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                 (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                            - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

LIKE MUCH MORE                                 1.        29        30.9        30.9        30.9

LIKE SOMEWHAT MORE                             2.        24        25.5        25.5        56.4

LIKE ABOUT THE SAME                            3.        41        43.6        43.6       100.0
                                                     -------     -------     -------     -------
                                            TOTAL        94       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              2.128

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                   24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =  24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS        SOUTH      ARLING
             NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE     QUES015          LIKE IDEA OF TEACHING MORE OR LESS NOW.

VALUE LABEL                                VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                               (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                           - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

LIKE MUCH MORE                               1.        36        38.3        38.3         38.3

LIKE SOMEWHAT MORE                           2.        23        24.5        24.5         62.8

LIKE ABOUT THE SAME                          3.        30        31.9        31.9         94.7

LIKE SOMEWHAT LESS                           4.         5         5.3         5.3        100.0
                                                   -------     -------     -------      -------
                                           TOTAL       94       100.0       100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             2.043

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

106

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH        ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES016             WANT AGE OF KIDS TO DIFFER THAN WHEN S.T

VALUE LABEL                                    VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                        FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                    (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                               - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
TEACH OLDER KIDS                                  1.          7         7.4         7.4         7.4

TEACH SAME AGE                                    2.         78        83.0        83.0        90.4

TEACH YOUNGER KIDS                                3.          3         3.2         3.2        93.6

SAME AGE OR OLDER                                 4.          5         5.3         5.3        98.9

SAME AGE OR YOUNGER                               5.          1         1.1         1.1       100.0
                                                         -------     -------     -------     -------
                                               TOTAL         94       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              2.096

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                              24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER     PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT     TAYLOR      HAWKEN     BMS         SOUTH       ARLING
             NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES017            WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE IN THE SYSTEM.

VALUE LABEL                                   VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                       FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                       0.        29          30.9         30.9        30.9

NO CHANGE. TOO EARLY                            1.         7           7.4          7.4        38.3

IMPROVE FIELD EXPER.                            2.        19          20.2         20.2        58.5

MORE INDIVIDUALIZED                             3.         8           8.5          8.5        67.0

MORE FREEDOM                                    4.        10          10.6         10.6        77.7

SOME PAY                                        5.         2           2.1          2.1        79.8

A FULL TEACHING DAY                             6.         5           5.3          5.3        85.1

EASE L.P.PREPARATION                            7.         3           3.2          3.2        88.3

OTHER                                           8.         8           8.5          8.5        96.8

EED COMPLETE CHANGE                             9.         3           3.2          3.2       100.0
                                                       -------     -------      -------     -------
                                              TOTAL       94         100.0        100.0       100.0

TATISTICS..

EAN            2.777

ALID   OBSERVATIONS -         94
ISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                    24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH       ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES018            HOW ARE CHANCES OF GETTING TEACHING JOB.

VALUE LABEL                                        VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                            FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
109                                                                     (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                                   - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                           0.          3          3.2         3.2         3.2

EXTREMELY GOOD                                      1.         19         20.2        20.2        23.4

PRETTY GOOD                                         2.         49         52.1        52.1        75.5

ONLY FAIR                                           3.         16         17.0        17.0        92.6

PRETTY BAD                                          4.          4          4.3         4.3        96.8

EXTREMELY BAD                                       5.          3          3.2         3.2       100.0
                                                            -------     -------     -------     -------
                                                   TOTAL       94        100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             2.085

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY         PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH       ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES019              HOW MANY EDUCATION CREDITS DO YOU HAVE.

VALUE LABEL                                      VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                          FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                      (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                                - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                          0.          10        10.6        10.6        10.6

1-30 SEMESTER HRS                                  1.          38        40.4        40.4        51.1

31-60 SEMESTER HRS                                 2.          27        28.7        28.7        79.8

61-120 SEMESTER HRS                                3.           3         3.2         3.2        83.0

OVER 120 SEMESTER HR                               4.          16        17.0        17.0       100.0
                                                           -------     -------     -------     -------
                                                 TOTAL          94       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              1.755

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                   24 MAY       PAGE   3

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS        SOUTH        ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES020            INTEND TO TEACH AFTER COMPLETING PROGRAM

VALUE LABEL                                  VALUE    ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
///                                                   FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

YES-INTEND TO TEACH                           1.         86          91.5         91.5         91.5

NO-S.T. CHANGED MIND                          2.          1           1.1          1.1         92.6

NO-ST DIDNT CHG MIND                          3.          3           3.2          3.2         95.7

UNDECIDED                                     4.          4           4.3          4.3        100.0
                                                      -------      -------      -------      -------
                                            TOTAL        94         100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              1.202

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
                                                                                     24 MAY         PAGE
FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER     PROSPE      MENTOR    CLEVHT       TAYLOR       HAWKEN       BMS          SOUTH        ARLING
             NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES021           WHERE WOULD YOU PREFER TO TEACH.

VALUE LABEL
                                         VALUE    ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE      ADJUSTED     CUMULATIVE
                                                  FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY     FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                               (PERCENT)     (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                         - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER
                                          0.          3           3.2           3.2          3.2
RURAL AREA
                                          1.          2           2.1           2.1          5.3
SUBURBAN AREA
                                          2.         52          55.3          55.3         60.6
URBAN AREA
                                          3.         15          16.0          16.0         76.6
INNER CITY AREA
                                          4.          4           4.3           4.3         80.9
ANY AREA
                                          5.          5           5.3           5.3         86.2
RURAL OR SUBURBAN
                                          6.          6           6.4           6.4         92.6
URBAN OR SUBURBAN
                                          7.          6           6.4           6.4         98.9
INNER C. OR SUBURBAN
                                          8.          1           1.1           1.1        100.0
                                                   -------      -------       -------      -------
                                         TOTAL       94         100.0         100.0        100.0
STATISTICS..

MEAN              2.957

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                    24 MAY      PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =  24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS        SOUTH      ARLING
             NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE     QUES022          DID YOU CHOOSE TO S.T. WHERE YOU ARE NOW

VALUE LABEL                                 VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                     FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                 (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                            - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
YES                                           1.        53         56.4        56.4        56.4

NO-PREFER RURAL                               2.         3          3.2         3.2        59.6

NO-PREFER SUBURBAN                            3.        15         16.0        16.0        75.5

NO-PREFER URBAN                               4.         4          4.3         4.3        79.8

NO-PREFER INNER CITY                          5.         3          3.2         3.2        83.0

NO-NOTHING SPECIFIED                          6.        16         17.0        17.0       100.0
                                                     -------     -------     -------     -------
                                            TOTAL       94        100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             2.457

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

113

114

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS        SOUTH       ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES023          HOW USEFUL HAVE EDUCATION COURSES BEEN.

VALUE LABEL                               VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                  FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                              (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                         - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

EXTREMELY HELPFUL                           1.       14         14.9        14.9        14.9

SOMEWHAT HELPFUL                            2.       34         36.2        36.2        51.1

NEUTRAL                                     3.       20         21.3        21.3        72.3

NOT VERY HELPFUL                            4.        9          9.6         9.6        81.9

NOT AT ALL HELPFUL                          5.       17         18.1        18.1       100.0
                                                  -------     -------     -------     -------
                                          TOTAL      94        100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             2.798

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                              24 MAY        PAGE  3

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH       ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES024          EDUCATION COURSES MORE MEANINGFUL NOW.

VALUE LABEL                                 VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                     FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                 (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                            - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

YES                                            1.        58        61.7        61.7        61.7

NO                                             2.        36        38.3        38.3       100.0
                                                      -------     -------     -------     -------
                                            TOTAL        94       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            1.383

VALID   OBSERVATIONS =         94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS =          0
```

115

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                           24 MAY      PAGE  ,

FILE     STUDEN (CREATION DATE =  24 MAY)  TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE     SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS       SOUTH       ARLING
            NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES025           ARE THE SCHOOLS AS YOU THOUGHT THEY WERE

VALUE LABEL                                   VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                      FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                  (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

NO ANSWER                                       0.          3         3.2         3.2         3.2

YES                                             1.         65        69.1        69.1        72.3

NO                                              2.         26        27.7        27.7       100.0
                                                      -------     -------     -------     -------
                                              TOTAL        94       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            1.245

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY        PAGE  4

FILE     STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS        SOUTH      ARLING
             NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE     QUES026             CONCEPT OF TEACHER ALTERED--IF SO HOW.

VALUE LABEL                                  VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                     FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                 (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

NO ANSWER                                      0.       24         25.5        25.5        25.5

NO                                             1.       16         17.0        17.0        42.6

MORE DEMANDING                                 2.       24         25.5        25.5        68.1

HARDER TO DISCIPLINE                           3.        5          5.3         5.3        73.4

STUDENT RAPPORT HARD                           4.        5          5.3         5.3        78.7

MORE RESPONSIBILITY                            5.        9          9.6         9.6        88.3

MORE EXCITING                                  6.        2          2.1         2.1        90.4

COURSES UNREALISTIC                            7.        6          6.4         6.4        96.8

OTHER                                          9.        3          3.2         3.2       100.0
                                                     -------     -------     -------     -------
                                             TOTAL      94        100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            2.394

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -         0
```

117

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                    24 MAY          PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE       SHAKER       PROSPE       MENTOR       CLEVHT       TAYLOR       HAWKEN       BMS          SOUTH        ARLING
              NOROLM       STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES027               EXTENT YOU STUDY OTHER TEACHERS.

VALUE LABEL                                      VALUE     ABSOLUTE      RELATIVE     ADJUSTED     CUMULATIVE
                                                           FREQUENCY     FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                         (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                            - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
VERY FREQUENTLY                                    1.            8          8.5          8.5          8.5

FREQUENTLY                                         2.           48         51.1         51.1         59.6

INFREQUENTLY                                       3.           26         27.7         27.7         87.2

HARDLY EVER                                        4.           12         12.8         12.8        100.0
                                                             -------      -------      -------      -------
                                                 TOTAL          94        100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             2.447

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                       24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE     MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS          SOUTH        ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE     QUES028           EXTENT YOU STUDY OTHER GRADE LEVELS.

VALUE LABEL                                   VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                       FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                        0.          4          4.3         4.3         4.3
VERY FREQUENTLY                                  1.          3          3.2         3.2         7.4
FREQUENTLY                                       2.         28         29.8        29.8        37.2
INFREQUENTLY                                     3.         36         38.3        38.3        75.5
HARDLY EVER                                      4.         23         24.5        24.5       100.0
                                                       -------     -------     -------     -------
                                              TOTAL         94        100.0       100.0       100.0
STATISTICS..

MEAN            2.755

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                         24 MAY        PAGE   4

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS        SOUTH      ARLING
             NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES029           EXTENT YOU WORK WITH OTHER TEACHERS.

VALUE LABEL                                 VALUE   ABSOLUTE   RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                    FREQUENCY  FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                               (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                            - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

VERY FREQUENTLY                               1.        28       29.8        29.8        29.8

FREQUENTLY                                    2.        29       30.9        30.9        60.6

INFREQUENTLY                                  3.        24       25.5        25.5        86.2

HARDLY EVER                                   4.        13       13.8        13.8       100.0
                                                    -------    -------     -------     -------
                                            TOTAL       94      100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              2.234

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                    24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT      TAYLOR     HAWKEN      BMS        SOUTH        ARLING
             NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES030          EXTENT YOU WORK WITH OTHER GRADE LEVELS.

VALUE LABEL                                       VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                           FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                       (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                                  - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

VERY FREQUENTLY                                     1.        9           9.6          9.6          9.6

FREQUENTLY                                          2.       17          18.1         18.1         27.7

INFREQUENTLY                                        3.       39          41.5         41.5         69.1

HARDLY EVER                                         4.       29          30.9         30.9        100.0
                                                           -------     -------      -------      -------
                                                  TOTAL      94         100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              2.936

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE     SHAKER     PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS        SOUTH        ARLING
            NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES031          WHY DID YOU AGREE TO S.T. IN THIS SCHOOL

VALUE LABEL                                  VALUE    ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
122                                                   FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                     0.          3           3.2          3.2          3.2

NO CHOICE                                     1.         29          30.9         30.9         34.0

CONVENIENT, LIKED IT                          2.         35          37.2         37.2         71.3

IT WAS TRADITIONAL                            3.          3           3.2          3.2         74.5

WANTED OPEN SCHOOL                            4.          6           6.4          6.4         80.9

IT WAS PROGRESSIVE                            5.          5           5.3          5.3         86.2

WANTED PUBLIC SCHOOL                          6.          1           1.1          1.1         87.2

WANTED CHALLENGE                              7.          3           3.2          3.2         90.4

PRE-S.T. AT SCHOOL                            8.          4           4.3          4.3         94.7

OTHER                                         9.          5           5.3          5.3        100.0
                                                      -------      -------      -------      -------
                                             TOTAL       94         100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              2.777

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

123

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                   24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN     BMS          SOUTH        ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES032          IS IT AS YOU THOUGHT--HOW SO OR HOW NOT.

VALUE LABEL                                VALUE    ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                   FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY     ADJ FREQ
                                                                (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)     (PERCENT)
                                         - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                     0.         9          9.6          9.6          9.6

NO PRECONCEIVED IDEA                          1.         6          6.4          6.4         16.0

YES                                           2.        34         36.2         36.2         52.1

EVEN BETTER                                   3.        16         17.0         17.0         69.1

YES-MORE FREEDOM                              4.         4          4.3          4.3         73.4

YES-BETTER EQUIPPED                           5.         2          2.1          2.1         75.5

NO                                            6.         3          3.2          3.2         78.7

MORE STU. PROBLEMS                            7.         6          6.4          6.4         85.1

MORE STRUCTURED                               8.        11         11.7         11.7         96.8

OTHER                                         9.         3          3.2          3.2        100.0
                                                   -------      -------      -------      -------
                                          TOTAL        94        100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            3.436

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -         0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT       TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS        SOUTH        ARLING
             NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE       QUES033            HAS YOUR CONCEPT OF KIDS CHANGED--HOW.

VALUE LABEL                                     VALUE     ABSOLUTE      RELATIVE      ADJUSTED     CUMULATIVE
124                                                       FREQUENCY     FREQUENCY     FREQUENCY     ADJ FREQ
                                                                        (PERCENT)     (PERCENT)     (PERCENT)
                                                - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                         0.          1            1.1           1.1           1.1

NO                                                1.         65           69.1          69.1          70.2

YES, NOT SPECIFIED                                2.          2            2.1           2.1          72.3

GREAT ACHIEVERS                                   3.          5            5.3           5.3          77.7

MORE MATURE                                       4.          5            5.3           5.3          83.0

HARDER TO HANDLE                                  5.          4            4.3           4.3          87.2

HARDER-KEEP INTEREST                              6.          2            2.1           2.1          89.4

LESS MATURE                                       7.          3            3.2           3.2          92.6

NEED MORE RESPECT                                 8.          2            2.1           2.1          94.7

OTHER                                             9.          5            5.3           5.3         100.0
                                                           -------       -------       -------       -------
                                                TOTAL        94          100.0         100.0         100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              2.319

VALID    OBSERVATIONS -         94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                      24 MAY          PAGE

FILE     STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS        SOUTH        ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE       QUES034             YOUR CONCEPT OF YOURSELF CHANGED--HOW.

VALUE LABEL                                  VALUE    ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                      FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                      0.          2          2.1          2.1          2.1

NO CHANGE                                      1.         32         34.0         34.0         36.2

YES, NOT SPECIFIED                             2.          5          5.3          5.3         41.5

FEEL MORE CONFIDENT                            3.         29         30.9         30.9         72.3

BETTER THAN REALIZED                           4.          4          4.3          4.3         76.6

IM LESS PREPARED                               5.          5          5.3          5.3         81.9

IMP. OF PATIENCE                               6.          4          4.3          4.3         86.2

AWARE IMP. OF CARING                           7.          1          1.1          1.1         87.2

AWARE MY WEAKNESSES                            8.          7          7.4          7.4         94.7

OTHER                                          9.          5          5.3          5.3        100.0
                                                      -------      -------      -------      -------
                                             TOTAL        94        100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN           3.213

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

125

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                            24 MAY        PAGE

FILE     STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE     SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS        SOUTH      ARLING
            NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES035          HOW HELPFUL ADULTS IN THE SCHOOL.

VALUE LABEL                                VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                               (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                           - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
EXTREMELY HELPFUL                            1.          48        51.1        51.1        51.1

SOMEWHAT HELPFUL                             2.          38        40.4        40.4        91.5

NEUTRAL                                      3.           6         6.4         6.4        97.9

NOT VERY HELPFUL                             4.           2         2.1         2.1       100.0
                                                   -------     -------     -------     -------
                                           TOTAL         94       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            1.596

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                 .                    24 MAY        PAGE   :

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS        SOUTH       ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES036          HOW MANY WEEKS HAVE YOU BEEN S.T.

VALUE LABEL                                    VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                       FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                            - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

NO ANSWER OR NONE                                0.          1         1.1         1.1          1.1

1-2 WEEKS                                        1.          1         1.1         1.1          2.1

5-6 WEEKS                                        3.         40        42.6        42.6         44.7

7-8 WEEKS                                        4.         18        19.1        19.1         63.8

9-10 WEEKS                                       5.         20        21.3        21.3         85.1

11-12 WEEKS                                      6.         13        13.8        13.8         98.9

MORE THAN 12 WEEKS                               7.          1         1.1         1.1        100.0
                                                       -------     -------     -------     -------
                                             TOTAL          94       100.0       100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              4.021

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH       ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES037            WHEN DID YOU BECOME IN CHARGE OF A CLASS

VALUE LABEL                                  VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                     FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                 (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

NO ANSWER OR NONE                             0.          8         8.5         8.5          8.5

1-2 WEEKS                                     1.         32        34.0        34.0         42.6

3-4 WEEKS                                     2.         27        28.7        28.7         71.3

5-6 WEEKS                                     3.         18        19.1        19.1         90.4

7-8 WEEKS                                     4.          8         8.5         8.5         98.9

9-10 WEEKS                                    5.          1         1.1         1.1        100.0
                                                     -------     -------     -------     -------
                                             TOTAL       94       100.0       100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              1.883

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                              24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE     SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS       SOUTH      ARLING
            NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES38A           ARE YOU COMPETENT IN YOUR CONTENT AREA.

VALUE LABEL                                   VALUE    ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                       FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                        0.          2          2.1          2.1          2.1

YES                                              1.         90         95.7         95.7         97.9

NO                                               2.          1          1.1          1.1         98.9

                                                 8.          1          1.1          1.1        100.0
                                                       -------      -------      -------      -------
                                              TOTAL         94        100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              1.064

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -           94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -            0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                             24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE     MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS        SOUTH       ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES38B          WHAT IS YOUR CONTENT AREA.

VALUE LABEL                                 VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
130                                                 FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                           - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                     0.        7          7.4          7.4          7.4
SCIENCE                                       1.        5          5.3          5.3         12.8
SOCIAL SCIENCE                                2.        6          6.4          6.4         19.1
MATH                                          3.        7          7.4          7.4         26.6
HISTORY                                       4.        6          6.4          6.4         33.0
ENGLISH                                       5.       10         10.6         10.6         43.6
OTHER                                         7.        6          6.4          6.4         50.0
ELEMENTARY EDUCATION                          8.       47         50.0         50.0        100.0
                                                   -------      -------      -------      -------
                                           TOTAL       94        100.0        100.0        100.0
STATISTICS..

MEAN               5.638

VALID   OBSERVATIONS =          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS =           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                      24 MAY      PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =  24 MAY)  TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE     SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR    CLEVHT     TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS        SOUTH      ARLING
            NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES039              HOW AWARE OF RESOURCES IN YOUR SCHOOL.

VALUE LABEL                               VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                  FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                              (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                          - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
EXTREMELY FAMILIAR                          1.        47        50.0        50.0        50.0

SOMEWHAT FAMILIAR                           2.        46        48.9        48.9        98.9

NOT AT ALL FAMILIAR                         3.         1         1.1         1.1       100.0
                                                  -------     -------     -------     -------
                                          TOTAL       94       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             1.511

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH       ARLIN(
             NORQLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES040              HOW AWARE OF RESOURCES IN YOUR COMMUNITY

VALUE LABEL                                 VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                    FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                            - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
EXTREMELY FAMILIAR                           1.        17         18.1        18.1        18.1

SOMEWHAT FAMILIAR                            2.        56         59.6        59.6        77.7

NOT AT ALL FAMILIAR                          3.        21         22.3        22.3       100.0
                                                    -------     -------     -------     -------
                                            TOTAL      94        100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            2.043

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                            24 MAY       PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS        SOUTH      ARLING
             NORQLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES041           HOW MUCH TEACHING PREPARATION PER DAY,

VALUE LABEL                                 VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                    FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                            - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

LESS THAN 1 HOUR                               1.         1         1.1         1.1         1.1

1 HOUR                                         2.         3         3.2         3.2         4.3

2 HOURS                                        3.        24        25.5        25.5        29.8

3 HOURS                                        4.        23        24.5        24.5        54.3

4 HOURS                                        5.        19        20.2        20.2        74.5

5 HOURS                                        6.        14        14.9        14.9        89.4

6-8 HOURS                                      7.         9         9.6         9.6        98.9

MORE THAN 10 HOURS                             9.         1         1.1         1.1       100.0
                                                    -------     -------     -------     -------
                                           TOTAL         94       100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             4.489

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                            24 MAY        PAGE

FILE     STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR      CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS        SOUTH       ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES042           ATTEND MEETINGS THAT COOP TEACHER IS IN.

VALUE LABEL                                    VALUE    ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                        FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                    (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                               - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                        0.         1          1.1         1.1          1.1

YES                                              1.        70         74.5        74.5         75.5

NO                                               2.        23         24.5        24.5        100.0
                                                        -------     -------     -------      -------
                                               TOTAL       94        100.0       100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            1.234

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

135

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                             24 MAY       PAGE

FILE     STUDEN (CREATION DATE =    24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE       SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS        SOUTH      ARLING
              NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE     QUES43A           YOUR AGE.

VALUE LABEL                                 VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                    FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                            - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                    0.         1          1.1         1.1         1.1

20-24 YEARS OLD                              1.        75         79.8        79.8        80.9

25-29 YEARS OLD                              2.         5          5.3         5.3        86.2

30-34 YEARS OLD                              3.         5          5.3         5.3        91.5

35-39 YEARS OLD                              4.         1          1.1         1.1        92.6

40-44 YEARS OLD                              5.         4          4.3         4.3        96.8

50-54 YEARS OLD                              7.         2          2.1         2.1        98.9

OVER 55 YEARS OLD                            8.         1          1.1         1.1       100.0
                                                    -------     -------     -------     -------
                                            TOTAL      94        100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             1.553

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -         0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                          24 MAY        PAGE

FILE     STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER      PROSPE     MENTOR    CLEVHT      TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS          SOUTH         ARLING
             NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE       QUES43C              ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY SCHOOL ATTENDED.

VALUE LABEL                                      VALUE    ABSOLUTE     RELATIVE     ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                          FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                       (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                               - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                          0.          1          1.1          1.1          1.1

RURAL AREA                                         1.          2          2.1          2.1          3.2

SUBURBAN AREA                                      2.         52         55.3         55.3         58.5

URBAN AREA                                         3.         24         25.5         25.5         84.0

INNER CITY AREA                                    4.          4          4.3          4.3         88.3

URBAN & SUBURBAN                                   5.          7          7.4          7.4         95.7

RURAL & SUBURBAN                                   8.          3          3.2          3.2         98.9

RURAL & URBAN                                      9.          1          1.1          1.1        100.0
                                                          -------      -------      -------      -------
                                                 TOTAL        94        100.0        100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN             2.787

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -         94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -          0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE       SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR     CLEVHT      TAYLOR      HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH       ARLING
              NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES43D             ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY SCHOOL ATTENDED.

VALUE LABEL                                   VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                      FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                  (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                              - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                       0.         1          1.1         1.1         1.1

PUBLIC SCHOOL                                   1.        45         47.9        47.9        48.9

PRIVATE, PAROCHIAL                              2.        41         43.6        43.6        92.6

BOTH                                            3.         7          7.4         7.4       100.0
                                                       -------     -------     -------     -------
                                              TOTAL       94        100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              1.574

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT      TAYLOR     HAWKEN      BMS        SOUTH       ARLING
             NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES43E            KIND OF SCHOOL STUDENT TEACHING IN.

VALUE LABEL                                  VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                     FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                 (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

NO ANSWER                                      0.         1         1.1         1.1         1.1

RURAL AREA                                     1.         1         1.1         1.1         2.1

SUBURBAN AREA                                  2.        72        76.6        76.6        78.7

URBAN AREA                                     3.        13        13.8        13.8        92.6

INNER CITY AREA                                4.         5         5.3         5.3        97.9

URBAN & SUBURBAN                               5.         1         1.1         1.1        98.9

RURAL & SUBURBAN                               8.         1         1.1         1.1       100.0
                                                      -------     -------     -------     -------
                                             TOTAL       94        100.0       100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            2,309

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                       24 MAY       PAGE

FILE     STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR    CLEVHT      TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS          SOUTH        ARLING
             NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE       QUES43F            KIND OF SCHOOL STUDENT TEACHING IN.

VALUE LABEL                                      VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED    CUMULATIVE
                                                         FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY    ADJ FREQ
                                                                     (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)    (PERCENT)
                                                 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                          0.          1         1.1         1.1          1.1

PUBLIC SCHOOL                                      1.         56        59.6        59.6         60.6

PRIVATE, PAROCHIAL                                 2.         37        39.4        39.4        100.0
                                                           -------     -------     -------      -------
                                                 TOTAL        94       100.0       100.0        100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN              1.383

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -           94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -            0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                          24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =  24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE       SHAKER      PROSPE      MENTOR     CLEVHT      TAYLOR     HAWKEN      BMS         SOUTH       ARLING
              NOROLM      STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES43J            YOUR COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.

VALUE LABEL                                  VALUE   ABSOLUTE   RELATIVE   ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                     FREQUENCY  FREQUENCY  FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                (PERCENT)  (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                             - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                      0.        1         1.1        1.1         1.1

CASE WESTERN RESERVE                           2.       20        21.3       21.3        22.3

CLEVELAND STATE                                3.        3         3.2        3.2        25.5

JOHN CARROLL                                   5.       10        10.6       10.6        36.2

ST. JOHN COLLEGE                               7.       31        33.0       33.0        69.1

OTHER                                          9.       29        30.9       30.9       100.0
                                                     -------    -------    -------     -------
                                             TOTAL      94       100.0      100.0       100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN            6.138

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -        94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -         0
```

```
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION                                                  24 MAY        PAGE

FILE      STUDEN (CREATION DATE =   24 MAY)   TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE      SHAKER     PROSPE     MENTOR     CLEVHT     TAYLOR     HAWKEN     BMS        SOUTH      ARLING
             NOROLM     STJOHN

VARIABLE      QUES43K           GRADE LEVEL OF S.T. EXPERIENCE.

VALUE LABEL                                  VALUE   ABSOLUTE    RELATIVE    ADJUSTED   CUMULATIVE
                                                     FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   FREQUENCY   ADJ FREQ
                                                                 (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)   (PERCENT)
                                            - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
NO ANSWER                                       0.         1         1.1         1.1         1.1

GRADES K THRU 3                                 1.        31        33.0        33.0        34.0

GRADES 4 THRU 6                                 2.        27        28.7        28.7        62.8

GRADES 7 THRU 9                                 3.        13        13.8        13.8        76.6

GRADES 10 THRU 12                               4.        14        14.9        14.9        91.5

GRADES K THRU 6                                 5.         5         5.3         5.3        96.8

GRADES 7 THRU 12                                6.         3         3.2         3.2       100.0
                                                      -------     -------     -------     -------
                                            TOTAL         94       100.0       100.0       100.0
STATISTICS..

MEAN             2.372

VALID   OBSERVATIONS -          94
MISSING OBSERVATIONS -           0
```

141

APPENDIX D

VERBATIM RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS FROM THE COOPERATING TEACHERS SURVEY

Conducted By The

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS COORDINATING COMMITTEE

As part of the SITE Project

Funded by a Grant from the

MARTHA HOLDEN JENNINGS FOUNDATION

Cleveland Commission on Higher Education
Cleveland, Ohio

April, 1972

Cooperating Teacher Responses

In March of 1972 the Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee conducted a questionnaire study of student teachers and cooperating teachers from teacher education centers operating in the Greater Cleveland area. A statistical tabulation of the results is available in a separate report. This report presents those verbatim responses from cooperating teachers which were of a substantive nature. Responses to the following questions are reported within:

Page

Question 5: Do you have on-going assistance during the student teaching term? If yes; What is the source of such assistance? What is the nature of this assistance? 1

Question 11: Have you suggested changes in the teacher preparation system? If yes; What was the response?. 5

Question 12: If you could change the teacher preparation system what would it be?. 7

Question 16: How are you compensated for your work with student teachers?. 12

Question 22: How has your philosophy of education been changed as a result of working with a student teacher?. 16

Question 24: What aspects of working with student teachers do you feel you are not prepared for? 19

Question 25: What would the most effective contribution the universities could make to help you be a more effective professional? 22

Question 27: Comments about this questionnaire or items on it. Include questions which should have been asked 27

5. Do you have on-going assistance during the student teaching term? If yes; What is the source of such assistance? What is the nature of this assistance?

Personally I find it more hindrance than help because of the person involved. I do not feel she is qualified.

A resident student teacher coordinator and a college representative. Supply student background, scholastic and personal. They also suggest teaching alternatives.

Directives from college involved - Assistance of a stable supervisor.

Center Director - joint appointee from Cleveland State and E.G. School Board. Seminars, meetings, etc.

There is absolutely no assistance from the University

Center Director.

Not clear.

Student teaching director once a week.

Dr. Macudlo from Case-Western Reserve has meetings (once a week) with student teachers and the supervising teacher.

Courses for student teachers.

Seminars and discussions.

Seminars, etc.

In the form of a C.S.U. operated Social Studies Teaching Center Director and Coordinator.

Faculty members on a weekly basis.

Advice from campus supervisor (limited).

Assistance in evaluation as well as methods and techniques.

Coordinator of Social Studies for East Cleveland City Schools meets regularly.

Meetings. Coordinator, University office available, if needed.

College professor living at own home gives assistance.

Evaluation of observational techniques, etc.

Coordinator of Associate Teachers.

(Continuation of)

5. Do you have on-going assistance during the student teaching term? If yes; What is the source of such assistance? What is the nature of this assistance?

Conferences with Center Director.

Our school is a center for student teachers though St. John College is the center's supervisor.

Supervision and availability for conferences when requested.

Group meetings with college supervisors, cooperating teachers, student teachers, and individual meetings.

Frequent meetings with university people - involvement by assistant principal.

Close contact with college supervisor - monthly meetings; alternately with student teachers and without them.

A member of the faculty came to the school once a week to check on the student and to help the cooperating teacher.

Supervisor from college comes - asks if there are any problems, etc.

College Supervisors can assist with any difficulties or concerns.

College Supervisor; principal of building - if needed, elementary supervisor.

Principal and college supervisor advised me.

Cooperation.

Questions answered by supervisor or by my principal.

University coordinator and center director.

College supervisor observes and conducts weekly seminar; teacher in district coordinates program as to scheduling, etc.

University representative is in our school one day each week.

Teacher Education Center.

Weekly visits and conferences.

College supervisors at our disposal. One assigned to our school - weekly visits.

(Continuation of)

5. Do you have on-going assistance during the student teaching term? If yes; What is the source of such assistance? What is the nature of this assistance?

Liason from Case Western Reserve comes out once every 2 weeks.

Center director available at all times.

Had a meeting with Reserve to discuss any problems and a meeting here in school.

Conferences with university people.

Meets weekly or when needed with supervising teacher and discusses problems.

Center Director at school.

Resource person available - freedom to call and obtain help or advice.

Resource person in the building one day a week (or whenever needed). The principal is also available and helpful.

Periodic conferences with the supervisor.

Rap sessions.

College supervisor once a week, Math team coordinator.

Supervisor.

T.E.C. Coordinator in building as staff member.

A consultant was available once a week to help solve any problems that developed.

Weekly visits by college instructor.

Myself and I can see the University about any problems.

Consultative assistance; presence of supervisor within the school one day per week.

Special program with Case Western Reserve where seminars, etc. are held here at Cleveland Heights High School.

Advisory - supervisory.

Weekly conference with general supervisor.

(Continuation of)
5. Do you have on-going assistance during the student teaching term? If yes; What is the source of such assistance? What is the nature of this assistance?

Meetings before experience begins; visitations by supervisors once a week.

An instructor from Case Western Reserve comes into the classroom about once a week after which we discuss things that have happen.

I have a coordinating teacher I can discuss problems with - he in turn has a university coordinator to consult with.

A supervisor is on call and spends much time at school to present openings if needed to talk with her.

College supervisor visits, principal assistance.

Availability to help with problems.

Supervising Coordinator.

Professor from the university has conferences during the student teaching period.

Consultation, Guidance, Evaluation.

Conferences regarding student teacher's progress.

11. Have you suggested changes in the teacher preparation system? If yes; What was the response?

I'm not sure if they will be implemented as we probably won't know until next year if we have a student teaching center again.

Response was favorable!

University will consider suggestions. Elementary student teaching program is new. University supervisor is very receptive to all suggestions.

The individual college faculty members were receptive and worked well in conjunction with the school faculty, however, suggestions could not always be implemented because of the "red tape" of college administrative policy.

More method work before student teaching.

None.

We will not know until the next term.

Favorable - but these changes occurred largely in the school in which I work.

Nothing from Case Western Reserve University.

None yet.

Rather favorable - we tried to work together; however, beauracracy hinders any follow up.

Always received suggestions and acted upon them.

Request: Prepare students for current practices of individualizing instructors -- Response: Thank you, but we don't know how to do that.

Better screening before entrance into the classroom. Agreement from Supervisors.

Favorable.

The college said they would make requirement booklets available. Teacher meetings would help also.

Good - very cooperative. College was quite agreeable.

(Continuation of)
11. Have you suggested changes in the teacher preparation system?
If yes; What was the response?

Very minor changes. Good-favorable response.

The University is considering some of them.

University is interested and will be attempting to implement.

More field experience and earlier introduction to actual teaching.

College evaluated suggestion; next semester followed it.

Greater pre-student teaching involvement in the school system.

Revamp the college instructional materials--no response.

Better preparation in specific fields. Some teaching experience offered before last year.

Student teaching should be a yearly experience. Response was heard.

This is the first time we have been involved in a student teaching center. Therefore, we will not know if our suggestions will be used until the next time.

John Carroll University has a fine program.

Receptive.

Good idea, but no implementation.

Not very receptive.

More supervision and suggestions from the university during student teaching.

Inaction - disinterest.

Little response.

Only in regard to the student teaching experience - It was agreed to in word but not in practice.

Scheduling.

Suggested recently, no time for response.

12. If you could change the teacher preparation system what would it be?

Require handwriting course in college. Methods courses should be directly involved in school situation. A full year of internship of student to allow more time in both lower and upper grades.

Better religion methods!

Stress earlier in the teacher preparation program some practical exposure to classroom participation. A student should be in the position earlier in his schooling to determine if teaching is what he truly wants and can do - personality is very important I feel, and a student should be in the position to determine early in his college career whether or not his ability and personality includes these abilities and the personality necessary for a "good" teacher.

I would start an interm program. The program would be such that after receiving a degree the prospective teacher would work in an Interm program for 1 year. Then he would be evaluated and a decision made on certification.

Do not send out a student teacher during the first semester, especially in grade 1. Children aren't prepared for another teacher by October of Grade 1.

More time spent observing in schools. Classes for methods - class on discipline - different types of class organization (flexible, traditional).

Place the student in as many opportunities as possible into a classroom. Various school systems, inner-city, rural, suburban, etc. - Expose them as soon as possible.

Widen the scope of the present laboratory experiences by initiating additional and earlier teaching-learning experience.

To include newer ways to teach and to have the student teacher more aware of audio visual aids in todays teaching.

I receive very good student teachers from Case Western Reserve.

To insure that all student teachers get a variety of teaching experiences - traditional, structured, open classroom, flexible, etc.

Training sessions for cooperating teachers - experimental methods courses for student teachers. In Western Reserve's setup the school person in charge of the program should not have student teachers. When he does it puts some people in a vulnerable spot.

I feel the program at John Carroll is very good.

(Continuation of)
12. If you could change the teacher preparation system what would it be?

A teacher should know what is expected of her and her student teacher.

Transfer responsibility from colleges to school systems at an earlier stage. Work to abolish the "Master Teacher" syndrome.

One year training period after 4 years of college equivalent to a masters degree.

More experiences in classroom situations prior to student teaching for Case Western Reserve. Students are far more prepared from other institutions.

St. John's seems to have an excellent program. The students are well prepared. There is good communication with the College.

Because this was my first student teaching experience and the student was very capable. I am unable to give any suggestions.

Some type of course in human relations, techniques of observation, evaluation, and methods for holding conferences.

Internship.

I think the more experience they have in the schools before student teaching, the better prepared they are.

Allow students in education to work with students and actively participate in a school system (not just field observation) to get feet wet before student teaching so they can evaluate themselves as to if this is the right field to pursue.

Include lesson plan formation.

More experience with high school observations before student teaching. Instill in student teachers a realization that he is basically an apprentice who must work according to the schedule of the school - He is really no longer a student of the university.

1) More realistic and practical "methods" courses. 2) Using a five year program: introduce the student into the classroom situation immediately and gradually increase this involvement each year until in their 5th year (internship), they are totally involved in the elementary school with only occassional visits to college. I think that the preparation is directed at the middle class inner-city or suburban child. There is a systematic (automatic) - not a diagnostic approach to different training situations.

More methods classes.

(Continuation of)
12. If you could change the teacher preparation system what would it be?

More practical approaches in learning how to handle discipline, how to develop student-teacher rapport, practical psych, and guidance in solving student created problems. More practical methods.

Have a continuous training program in the school beginning in the sophomore year of college and with the fourth or fifth year entirely student teaching.

Have students do more teaching - have them enter schools earlier in their training.

I would like one meeting beforehand with cooperating teachers and the college supervisor so all would have the same information.

More in-school experience.

Earlier classroom experiences with children. Courses in working with parents and classroom organization and discipline.

I would like to see it be lengthened to a more realistic term - i.e. one year.

I like the preparation from St. John College. I don't like to see teachers who have taught several years go back to do student teaching. It means leaving your own class to do student teaching.

Student teaching should be one semester (or two quarters), all day. Students should be in the classroom by their Junior year; and should be kept in the classroom as observers, tutors, and "teachers."

Much more classroom experience - strong courses in child psychology and inter-personal relationships.

More field experience and earlier introduction to actual teaching. Should be internship for student-teacher; should always be a full day experience - half-day is unfair to students.

I feel St. John's does a very good job. I'm not too well acquainted with other colleges.

There should be a greater emphasis placed on pre-assessment of skills. Should a candidate for student teaching have one glaring weakness (poor communication skills due to heavy accent) remedial measures should be taken before student teaching experience.

Extend the amount of in classroom experience -- pay student teachers for their efforts -- pay experience students for their work.

(Continuation of)
12. If you could change the teacher preparation system what would it be?

Provide teaching experience during 2nd year of college - screen prospective teachers at end of 2nd year before a faculty committee.

Prepare the cooperating teacher concerned in a better way. There should be a workshop of some sort for cooperating teachers.

Try to aid student teachers in becoming aware of actual teaching conditions in schools. Try to eliminate as many "Surprises" as possible.

Student teacher should be a yearly experience. Flanders and Smith and Smith often does work.

A longer exposure in the classroom - Possibly adding another year to the preparation for a degree.

More frequent visits from campus supervisor.

Weed out by some method incompetents before they reach the student teaching phase of their preparation.

John Carroll University has a fine program.

More observation and participation in freshman, sophomore and junior years.

Less book work - actual experience methods on how to plan a lesson.

Case Western Reserve's program seems quite ample.

Improve placement in relationship to student teachers own background and type of situation he plans to teach in.

Require one month of observation and involvement in a school system prior to student teaching. This period of time should be required of all juniors planning a teaching career.

Student teaching should be for one school year with some type of financial aid.

Give the student teacher more time in a variety of class situations over a longer period of time.

Provide for an earlier field experience; e.g. sophomore year - for at least 3-4 hours per day. Students could then decide whether they wanted to enter the position.

More supervision and suggestions from the university during student teaching.

(Continuation of)
12. If you could change the teacher preparation system what would it be?

Student teachers should not have afternoon classes at universities. In general, the more actual, realistic experience the better.

Move towards a more genuine teacher-center concept -- one with prospective student teachers becoming involved in their sophomore year plus valuable, on-going in-service sessions for cooperating teachers.

I would go to a differentiated staff. Internship would replace student teaching. There would be low pay, but training as an intern might last for up to two years depending on competency.

More field experience before practice teaching. More selectivity or screening to obtain a totally committed individual into the teaching profession.

Full semester - fully engrossed in situations - not 1/2 day.

Longer apprentice-type training.

To have a longer (possibly a year) student teaching time.

More aware of what to look for in observing.

I think if it could be devised they should have more opportunity to be with more than one grade level. So often girls go to small places to have positions in other grade levels.

By end of freshman year - some (1/2 of schedule) courses in education and some experience with kids - tutoring. By end of sophomore year - more work with kids and classroom experience. By end of junior year - more class work (taking over a group of kids). 1st quarter senior year to student teaching; 2nd quarter specialize in one area only - continue to work with kids and pick up courses in areas of weaknesses. Last quarter - free to choose any type of class - to mentally prepare for own class and receive special help.

16. How are you compensated for your work with student teachers?

May take a course at the college.

I don't know.

An X amount of monies are sent to me from one of the participating schools.

I receive complimentary courses at the College.

$50 stipend

$100 per semester

$100

Not - to the best of my knowledge

By $75.00 stipend

Set Fee, Some Free Classes

Cash

University $50 per class

Stipend of $65.00

$25.00 per class from Case Western.

Money

By check

None that I know of

A free course

Monetarily

Have not been told

$50 compensation

An honorarium

Offered free courses at the college which can be used toward our degree

Financial &/or tuition free college courses

Cash

(Continuation of)
16. How are you compensated for your work with student teachers?

Given one course at the college - tuition free.

An honorarium of $150.00.

Money. Personal satisfaction.

I may take one graduate course without cost.

I think $75.00 for the semester. We have suggested some type of training or in-service courses offered by the university.

Free course offered at college.

Monetary.

Money.

College courses can be taken without tuition charges.

Money.

St. John College offers Supervising Teachers the opportunity of enrolling in course of her own choice.

By being given a free course from the college.

Free tuition at college providing student teachers.

Offered to take a course free of charge at College.

Financial. $75.00.

Direct cash payment from the University.

$75.00 per student teachers.

Money from College.

By university.

Pay varies according to college.

$25.00 per student teacher per period.

Paid $100.00.

As far as I know, I'm not.

The College allows you a tuition waiver on a 3 hour graduate course.

(Continuation of)
16. How are you compensated for your work with student teachers?

I feel a great satisfaction for having been able to help, direct, and/or work with another fellow teacher.

Free course at the college.

Monetarily - from university.

Offered free college course.

Money - $70.00 full day - $35.00 half day.

By the ideas that they hope-ully bring to the classroom.

$100.00.

Receive a stipend.

Extra pay.

Between $100.00 and $200.00.

College courses offered - free.

College gives you opportunity to take course - free.

One tuition - free course at the college.

From the University.

University pays $25.00 per teacher per class.

Small stipend - access to university information.

Financially.

We have not heard yet.

Not sure.

Money? I don't know - student teaching "center" in our school - compensation will be shared.

Money - this year being in a center we have not been told if the money will come to us individually or to the entire building.

One course is offered free at St. John College by presenting a letter to the bureau signed by the President.

(Continuation of)
16. How are you compensated for your work with student teachers?

I receive a letter entitling me to take a course at the college tuition free.

Financial compensation.

Fee.

Small cash.

A check at the close of the student teaching experience.

Any course is offered by the college at no cost.

We receive free tuition for one course at college.

Shared with other teachers concerned and usually little "thanks" for time needed to explain work plus curriculum to student teacher.

I was given a small stipend.

Fee paid to school.

Money.

Money - materially. Self-belief experience was helpful to student.

$75.00 for 10 weeks.

22. How has your philosophy of education been changed as a result of working with a student teacher?

I do not believe that the student teaching experience has effected my philosphy although other factors may have.

None.

It has not been to any great extent.

No.

Frequently!

As much individualization as possible should be arranged for all students.

No.

None.

I can see how poorly college courses in Ed. have been and still are.

Not.

None.

It has broadened, since I am reminded how difficult first year teaching may be.

Yes.

None.

Somewhat--especially in testing out my own ideas as far as experiments in education are concerned. Also they are the nearest thing I've had to a teaching assistant.

Not at all.

No, but it has instilled enthusiasm.

Have become more apt to accept a variety of techniques.

I've become very realistic in my appraisal of the goals I set for the students--I've become less rigid in my relationship with adults.

Somewhat, I feel I learn from them.

Keep up with "todays" education.

It has been modified and I feel improved.

Only slightly. Rather, other, more prominent forces have been at work formulating the philosphy.

(Continuation of)
22. How has your philosophy of education been changed as a result of working with a student teacher?

Student teachers have always enriched my own teaching personality - have had to question my own motives and educational techniques - helped me to keep young in ideas.

Feel more strongly about the need for earlier determination on whether the student is inherently qualified for teaching - strength - leadership - personality.

I learn flexibility from them and get new ideas.

I believe that I (a completely traditional teacher) will become more liberal as a result of my work with the student teacher.

Reaffirmed concept that motivations must be constant and challenging for good learning to take place.

Yes, I am aware that many college instructors present an unreal "sterile" picture of a real classroom situation.

Been made broader.

More optimistic.

No - it has been positively reinforced.

I try to run as much of an open classroom as possible within the closed system. Since my students have seemed in one instance to perform better under a slightly more authoritarian personality and in the other instance have reacted hostilely to a new person.

A greater recognition of the role of the teacher as a teacher of teachers.

Very little.

In no way.

No, only strengthened.

No, it has been enriched to a certain degree.

Not at all.

Not at all.

No, but I find it an enlightening experience; I have learned many new ideas.

Haven't.

I think university education departments are out of touch with the world of high school teaching.

(Continuation of)
22. How has your philosophy of education been changed as a result of working with a student teacher?

No.

It hasn't really changed except it has become for me a convincing reality that teaching is a profession with which a teacher cannot be mediocre.

Basically no--only enriched.

No.

No.

No.

No--only reinforced; it has not changed.

Not at all.

Perhaps not changed but improved with my contacts with dedicated student teachers.

My philosophy of education has changed--but not as a result of working with student teachers. I enjoy working with them--they are enthusiastic, fresh, & creative but they are not cause of fundamental changes in educational programs, structures, etc.

No.

I am realizing that there are many teachers in the field that don't belong. Just like our students some student teachers have not been guided into the proper field.

I have tried some new ideas and am more flexible in my approach. I am aware that we make too many assumptions based on our experiences as students.

A greater respect for "new" ideas.

They give you new ideas and motivate you to do something new--at least I feel this way--other are too lazy.

No.

Need for good organization in classroom. Basic philosophy has not changed.

None--you can do much with another teacher in the room--I learn that--they give me new ideas.

I think before my philosophy was very idealistic and realistic, but now I think to survive we must be efficient and very practical too!

24. What aspects of working with student teachers do you feel you are not prepared for?

Working with several at the same time.

I try very hard to work on a peer level with her, consequently, I find it difficult to point out weaknesses on her part.

I feel adequately prepared.

In depth Science Lab work - Music theory (teaching).

None.

I don't know - some I am sure but if I knew then I would prepare myself.

Handle Audio-Visual Equipment.

"Mod" aspects of the world.

None, so far.

Providing them continually with new approaches that might be outside my style of teaching but within theirs.

Adequate and beneficial evaluation.

Experiences that cannot be planned - I am not really, since anyone can be trained for certain discipline, problems, etc.

I feel that a workshop sponsored jointly by the university and school district would be very beneficial in any areas where a teacher might be deficient.

None.

No comment.

None - After all my years of experience I was well prepared.

Demonstrating newer techniques of teaching.

Techniques of evaluation - Should all evaluations be all encompassing or should they be concentrating on certain specific areas only?

None.

How much is expected of them.

I have trouble getting student teachers to realize the subtlies of planning their lessons - but this is probably why they're here.

(Continuation of)
24. What aspects of working with student teachers do you feel you are not prepared for?

Physical problems. (Speech problems, etc.). Emotional problems that are outside of the teaching environment.

I do not feel that I am prepared sufficiently to work with students coming from colleges with varying philosophies.

I honestly can't think of any.

Innovative approaches recently researched by universities.

How to help with disciplinary problems, how to counsel in this area.

Relating his experiences here with his class work and seminar topics at the university.

Emotional problems.

Evaluation.

What to expect and how to reach students.

Teaching the student teacher to:
Become involved with students (react to different situations).
Communicate what is being done along with trying new ideas.

I lack the experience that seems to be so useful in advising student teachers.

I may be prepared to face the daily scheme of teaching, but I tend to lack the particular way the student teacher begins to focus his attention on individual classroom situations.

I'm not prepared for an unqualified one, or for one that doesn't like children.

None.

Evaluation.

I can't think of any.

I often feel I do not adequately advise in specific situations that may involve discipline.

The student teacher's lack of understanding what teaching is all about i.e. student-teacher relationship.

Guiding them on the emotional level of their problems.

I find it difficult to build confidence and agressiveness in those individuals lacking these qualities. It is extremely difficult to work with those who feel threatened by or actual aversion to student population.

(Continuation of)
24. What aspects of working with student teachers do you feel you are not prepared for?

If a student teacher is a bit older than me, I sometimes feel a bit awkward in making suggestions. (Once I had a teacher 20 years older than I.)

None.

Evaluation in a constructive way.

None.

I feel rather competent in working with students. I take one or two refresher courses each Summer.

Their personal, psychological problems. These should have been dealt with by college personnel long before student teaching.

Changing the personality of student teachers.

Getting them to accept things that I have learned without their actually experiencing them.

Relating to their college courses.

Formal supervision.

Offering ways to have her become animated for the primary children.

Evaluation.

Setting standards - college requirements were casual. Our team-teaching world is highly structured.

At times their having problems with kids.

25. What would the most effective contribution the universities could make to help you be a more effective professional?

In some way, keeping us posted of programs being tried by the university, e.g. B.G.S.U. Methods Experience Project done in Toledo. Changes being offered in line of coursework. Results of experimental programs the university has tried.

Give courses in being a supervising teacher.

A confusing question - do you mean in my own training - or now as a professional guiding a student teacher? If it is the latter, the most help the university can give is screening the student teachers thoroughly early in their college career.

In some way have a loan program on equipment and speakers in Physics.

Seminars concerning new methods, A-V materials.

In-service training. More knowledge of school and general class situations by the supervisor to better aid student teachers. We are at the beginning of a plan to make our school a student teaching center. I think this is an exciting plan - one that will benefit schools and universities in many ways - some I'm sure we haven't thought of yet.

Offer free in-service workshops in Art/Music/Science approaches and Remedial Reading Labs.

Offering more clinics, workshops, etc.

To provide in-service help for cooperating teachers.

Raise their salaries.

1. Flexibility. The university should allow, or rather encourage, much broader experience. Some student teachers are exposed to only one teaching technique. 2. Realism. A more realistic, process-oriented approach to teaching.

Workshop on methods not necessarily run by university professors but sponsored by them. It has been my experience that the university professors have little to offer the classroom teacher.

Teach students how to prepare a lesson.

Create more time for meetings and workshops.

(Continuation of)

25. What would be the most effective contribution the universities could make to help you be a more effective professional?

The expectations of supervising teachers should be listed; also a uniform evaluation system should be used.

Workshops in new methods, etc. Resource personnel for students.

I, like most student teachers and universities, was very idealistic when I graduated. Then I got into a classroom situation -- need I say more?

Less educational courses and more context. A course in special methods would suffice.

A good lecture series, minimal costs, not promoting or selling anything but timely methods, insights and new ideas!

Informing cooperating teachers of new requirements in their specific area which must be met by university students. Providing a working knowledge for cooperating teachers of subject matter of methods courses in their particular subject field.

Offer classes as compensation -- use classroom teachers as resource people.

Have the prospective teachers teach for small periods of time single concept lessons beginning in their junior year.

Occassional workshops.

More guidelines of what is to be expected.

Offer some effective courses or other programs on student teaching/subject matter as it applies to high school, etc. - However, I don't think they are capable of doing it because of rather traditional, old fashioned approaches.

1. Increased flow of planning, 2. Joint determination of student experiences, 3. The college should encourage their personnel to become knowledgeable (provide them experiences and in-service work on new trends, etc.) in or due to be resources to field workers.

Pay for courses.

A Pre-student teacher conference in order to be better prepared to work with the student teacher.

(Continuation of)
25. What would be the most effective contribution the universities could make to help you be a more effective professional?

Offer graduate courses that would help us in the classroom; Behavior Modification, Emotional-Problem Children. We need to learn more about handling the problems of children in the classroom.

I feel the college has already given effective contribution.

When special programs are going on in nearby University--speaker of note relating to Ed. problems--University should invite teachers to attend.

Make it a little easier to take courses of interest and value at other colleges and have them accepted by your own college.

Students must have greater exposure to student populations before student-teaching experience. Some sort of tutoring experience prior to student teaching should be mandatory.

Provide in service training on significant trends in curriculum development, individualization, and special education.

Be honest about the activities of classroom activities and student responses.

It would help if there could be a closer involvement between the Universities and Secondary Schools including the faculties.

Offer additional courses - relating the needs and expectations of student teachers.

Conduct joint seminars with student teachers--Publish complete guide on suggested procedures.

Courses that would keep us abreast with the new methods of teaching.

Make them more aware of their own personal epistemolegy and basic philosophical beliefs--as it is this that determines ones effective use of the various methods and teaching strategies.

Enable our school system to take courses free as compensation for being in a "student teaching" school.

Do more in area of actual class work presentation.

To be able to sit in a session and talk with prospective student teachers concerning the classroom situation. (From a personal standpoint).

(Continuation of)
25. What would be the most effective contribution the universities could make to help you be a more effective professional?

Stop giving all those "bullshit" lectures and start teaching student teachers how to teach! Dewey, Kilpatrick, etc. don't hold up in an inner city classroom. So many profs just don't know what's going on in this public school system.

Change their whole approach in developing teachers. Re-educate me.

Institute more realistic education classes for potential teachers.

In-service and differentiated staffing.

Don't dictate so much of the student teacher's experience.

Graduate credit for being a supervising teacher, possibly with course work to supplement in the area of managing student teachers.

Meaningful in-service sessions.

They could give me more college training. Possibly they could sponsor a course of studies to promote more and better teacher educators.

I would suggest continuing education in the area of supervising teacher.

Give graduate courses--such as workshops--that would deal with the problems of teacher education. Make these courses meaningful to professional, dedicated, teachers, stressing classroom improvement rather than stressing just another test or another paper or both!

Introduce teacher-oriented courses and workshops at minimal costs in schools or areas of high concentration of interested teachers.

They could hold student teaching seminars at the school so that teachers and student teachers could gain from them.

Allow me to take graduate course work in addition to compensation.

Make results of research available to schools through newsletters, etc.

More in class experience for the students. Also college teaching techniques should set better examples for good teaching (Not just lectures).

Update themselves and get out of theory and idealisms.

They could be more realistic in their financial approaches. First in how they themselves handle ~~the~~ taxpayers money, teach students to watch out, and reimburse their supervising teachers.

(Continuation of)
25. What would be the most effective contribution the universities could make to help you be a more effective professional?

In service courses on innovations in teaching such as how to conduct an "open classroom," new methods of teaching science, individualized instruction (reading and math) use of audio visual equipment.

Resource center for teaching enrichment. Training program - by teachers with successful experience - for individualizing.

27. Comments about this questionnaire or items on it. Include questions which should have been asked.

Question #18 impractical as we teach 100% at the beginning and less toward the end of student teacher's experience. We confer almost all the time, every free minute, before, during, and after school hours in session.

#25 is a confusing question as I point out. Could ask for comments on our particular present experience with our student teacher - comments that might illuminate the short answers given in the questionnaire.

I don't know what response should be made for #24. I feel I understand his problems. We discuss them and I am hoping they are a valuable experience for him. I feel that the professional should attend several practicum classes with the student teacher and be a part of the discussion (Value to teacher and student teacher).

I left out #22 and #24 as these are extremely difficult to answer without much thought. Questions of this nature might better be answered in discussion groups of supervising teachers.

A very honest and comprehensive questionnaire -- Could have asked about methods of evaluating students as well as how did student teachers find the experience.

1) What do we think will be the most beneficial part of the experience for the student teacher? 2) How grade conscious are the student teachers, 3) What do we think of the evaluation process?

#13 is a "strange" question. I could not answer it. I have experience in suburban and inner city schools, but I could not answer it. Doesn't an honest answer assume observation of the student teacher or prior knowledge that is not available.

How well did your college or university prepare you for the everyday problems faced in the classroom or school? Most student teachers have this problem. I know I learned more by observing my younger brothers and sisters and working with youth groups than any undergraduate or graduate course ever taught me about human behavior.

This questionnaire was answered with reference to present student teachers from Case Western Reserve University.

Sufficiently and efficiently covered.

What weaknesses do student teachers demonstrate?

(Continuation of)

27. Comments about this questionnaire or items on it. Include questions which should have been asked.

Questions 6 and 13 are hard to judge. If my student teacher is not knowledgeable concerning certain subject matter she researches and learns the necessary material. Therefore, she is knowledgeable when she works with the students. Question 13 calls for assumptions as I don't really know what is required in different types of teaching situations.

Question No. 13 must refer to student at time of questionnaire--should be pointed out in question--hopefully it would be diff. in 2 months!

When are the universities going to become flexible enough to provide a richer and more significant program in teacher education?

Questions 6-7-8-13 & 17 poorly prepared--little or no allowance clearly made to evaluate more than one student teacher for whom you are responsible.

Some questions were hard to answer especially if not involved in that specific area or situation.

I feel this questionnaire is quite adequate.

I can't think of any.

To educate someone a person must be able to move with the times. Education is at least 30-40 years behind in Cleveland.

The questions in general are excellent. My only criticism might be to have room to praise or degrade the student teaching program as far as the University's role is concerned.

I have answered this questionnaire as a Center Director, trying to answer all questions generally about the number of student teachers I have worked with.

Too personal.

I don't think educators have quite yet figured out what teachers should be doing in the classroom thus a clarification of this point should be made first, before any attempt is made to figure out what student teachers should be doing.

I didn't understand #14 - Some of the questions were worded poorly.

Well done!

(Continuation of)
27. Comments about this questionnaire or items on it. Include questions which should have been asked.

1) What problems did your student perceive? 2) If you have an effective plan for gradually including students, what is it? 3) What specific changes (evidence of growth) did you perceive in the student teacher? 4) What were the advantages for the children in having a student teacher? 5) Were there any disadvantages? What? 6) Do you feel that 6 weeks is sufficient time?

Questionnaires are difficult to answer for people in center concept. Numbers are misleading (as in #9 and #21).

Is student teaching successful at your school?

You forgot kdg. in question #26. Many of these questions are difficult to answer as we have a student teaching center at our school.

Not able to answer.

Question #18 is unanswerable.

Some questions can not be answered concerning student teachers. Some seem to force you to generalize and I can't.

I felt it was extremely difficult to think in terms of "now" because I have seen little change in students or student teaching in the past 5 years - and I have been looking!

APPENDIX E

VERBATIM RESPONSES TO
OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS FROM THE
STUDENT TEACHERS SURVEY

Conducted By The

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS COORDINATING COMMITTEE

As part of the SITE Project

Funded by a Grant from the

MARTHA HOLDEN JENNINGS FOUNDATION

Cleveland Commission on Higher Education
Cleveland, Ohio

April, 1972

Student Teacher Responses

In March of 1972 the Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee conducted a questionnaire study of student teachers and cooperating teachers from teacher education centers operating in the Greater Cleveland area. A statistical tabulation of the results is available in a separate report. This report presents those verbatim responses from student teachers which were of a substantive nature. Responses to the following questions are reported within:

Page

Question 2: What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly liked? 1

Question 3: What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly disliked?. 7

Question 12: Have you suggested changes in the student teacher system? If yes, what was the response?. 12

Question 17: If you could change the system what would it be? 15

Question 26: How has your concept of a teacher been altered? If so, how?. 19

Question 31: Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?. 22

Question 32: Is it as you thought? How so? How not? 27

Question 33: Has your concept of kids changed? If yes, how?. 31

Question 34: Has your concept of yourself changed? If yes, how?. . . 33

Question 43: Comments about this questionnaire or items on it 35

2. What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly liked?

I enjoyed the team teaching and I was in a pod school and enjoyed the relaxed atmosphere for the children.

I liked having some of the students in my classroom and being able to work with them. My cooperating teacher was helpful also.

My cooperating teacher was extremely helpful and a wonderful person to work with.

My critic teacher had very helpful criticism. She shared the burden of work--she never just dumped all the work on me.

Having a student enjoy and appreciate what you are teaching.

Opportunity to try out different things-- an open critic teacher.

I worked under a departmentalized situation. All three teachers were excellent in their fields. I felt I got the best from each. Each gave me complete charge of the class and I really enjoyed the children.

My cooperating teacher is a gem. Not only is he understanding, but very helpful and encouraging in all areas. The whole department here is good and I had the opportunity to work with 4 teachers.

1. My cooperating teacher
2. The school, students and environment

The students.

Good AV equipment in school.
13 others in the school.

I had an excellent critic teacher who was very helpful, and the class was very enjoyable--I learned quite a bit.

Everything! I had a very great cooperating teacher. She gave me evaluations on most of my lessons and she helped me considerably. She was a good teacher and a warm, helpful person and she taught me much!

The interest of my cooperating teacher. Her willingness to help at anytime and her thoughtfulness in suggesting ideas to make my teaching experience easier and more enjoyable.

The relationships developed between teacher-student teacher, student teacher-student teacher, students - student teachers and contact with young people.

My cooperating teacher, who has been very helpful. I also liked being able to share something of what I have learned with others.

(Continuation of)
2. What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly liked?

Initiating my own creative ideas, working with my cooperative teacher, developing my own teaching skills.

I got along well with the cooperating teacher. I also liked the course, the materials used, and the way my cooperating teacher advised me to teach the course.

The freedom and flexibility that I had in conducting my classes, also the freedom to choose topics I desired.

I particularly liked my cooperating or supervising teacher who was most helpful since she allowed me to experiment with new ideas and who would constructively criticize my lessons.

My teacher was very creative and patient and taught me how to be. The classroom I am in is open. This is very good because now I am trained well for a job.

Close relationship with critic teacher; more of a team teaching approach as I gained experience.

Working in an open school--felt that the experience was vital. Also enjoyed being with the people that I was with very much.

My preference of grade level was respected.
The staff was helpful and congenial.
My cooperating teacher was excellent.

I liked all of it.

I was able to get experience in a pod school's primary section. Therefore, I got to deal with first, second and third graders. I liked the team teaching too.

I liked the way the supervising teacher made me feel very welcome and very much a part of the classroom!

My supervising teacher and the Parma School system.

Gaining self-confidence with students.
Interaction with students.

Working with the students in an open school.

I liked the freedom I had in the classroom. Open education situation permitted me to handle a group of students in whatever way I was most comfortable with.

I enjoyed the entire educational experience. I feel that by working directly in the classroom I learned more about teaching than in all my years in college classrooms.

(Continuation of)
2. What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly liked?

Children's acceptance of me.

I liked all the suggestions, help and constructive criticism that improved my teaching.

In the particular school I was in the teachers were all extremely warm and helpful.

My cooperating teacher was very helpful. My student teaching was a wonderful experience.

I liked working with the first graders. My reasons for this are as follow: they wanted to learn, they say the cutest things, and they make you really enjoy teaching.

The school was very modern. My teacher was fantastic! She shared all her materials with me. My unit was fun and I enjoyed the experiences I had in other grades.

The teacher was well organized enough to give me the amount of structure I needed at first. Then she more or less let me "do my thing." The children were so well behaved that I could try a variety of things.

Relationship with others. The cooperation and home-like atmosphere gave me the confidence and enthusiasm to teach and try out some ideas.

The knowledge that I can teach children and more than just babysit. Just being in contact with children and enjoying their unique personalities has made a tremendous difference in my outlook on life. One of the best things that ever happened to me.

I was able to try out some different ideas in the classroom; I gained experience in working with the Drama Club by having rehearsals with the children after school; I did not have to conform to my cooperating teacher's style--rather I taught in my own way.

The variety of techniques and creativity employed in teaching.

I was able to work in my chosen grade level plus I had the opportunity of working with an excellent cooperating teacher.

My cooperating teacher was very helpful. The class was very well behaved and very easy to work with. Motivation was no problem.

The opportunity to work with real children in an actual classroom experience, and to gain experience and know-how in teaching.

New techniques in spite of a seven year background--always room for growth.

(Continuation of)

2. What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly liked?

The chance to observe another teacher.

The people at the school were pleasing to work for and the students showed an interest and a concern in my experience.

The "center" concept of teacher placement; the high degree of professionalism among fellow student-teachers; the placement with two critic teachers; the length of the student-teaching period.

Integrated Educational Experiences.
Great facilities.

The helpfulness of the cooperating teacher as compared to that of the previous cooperating teacher I had--this recent teacher spent as long as was necessary helping me plan a lesson.

Working with the students in class and on an individual basis; trying various teaching techniques; the relaxed atmosphere with the teachers and other student teachers.

Mutual respect between teacher and class. Organization within class and school.

Working with the children in small groups or individually. Introducing methods and practices new to the children and finding their responses very positive.

Mentor school system had very few discipline problems and the friendliness and cooperation of math department made my work there very pleasant.

Interaction with the students.

I particularly liked being able to use the knowledge I have accumulated in the past.

Relationship with critic teacher and class, friendly atmosphere of entire school.

Children were easy to work with. Assisting teacher permitted creative ideas concerning teaching.

The new experience made it likeable. I also enjoyed working with the experienced teachers--they were very helpful.

I liked being placed in a building where the teachers acted like professionals and did not indulge in petty jealousies. I enjoyed being in a school that was active in the Glasser program.

I liked the idea that I could be creative in my teaching and try whatever methods I wanted.

(Continuation of)
2. What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly liked?

Small classes.

My supervising teachers give me complete freedom to use my own methods and ideas. They also support me--both the students and I are very aware of this.

Was a "learning experience"--teachers were very helpful.

My master teacher was very helpful and understanding. She is a very good teacher.

I benefited most by learning by actually doing. I find my student teaching experience to be the most worthwhile of my professional courses because I am actually in the class interacting with the children.

Working with such honest, joyful, loving little children!

The cooperation of students and teachers, especially the positive attitude of the students about class material. Frank & honest help from supervisor without feeling pressured by her presence.

Could move freely to watch and inquire among the children; had freedom to try own ideas and methods; could add responsibilities at my own speed--was not pressured to speed up nor hold back.

The cooperating teacher showed confidence in me and gave me free reign to try out any ideas I thought might work. I was treated as a teacher not just a helper.

The aid and help given by the other teachers to all even the other teachers.

I felt in the suburban community that it was an unreal situation with no black people at all around. The children spoke of Negroes as freaks.

I enjoyed working on preparations of group presentations with other student teachers in the pod as well as the team teachers.

Amount of responsibility.

The supervising teacher was extremely helpful to me, I liked the school, there was a good, open atmosphere between me and the teacher(s).

The sincere interest on the part of the faculty and especially the principal.

Everything but detailed lesson plans.

My cooperating teacher was excellent. She guided me but did not tell me what to do. I really took over the class. The principal and faculty were very helpful.

(Continuation of)
2. What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly liked?

I liked being on my own as much as I could.

I particularly liked the opportunity of having my lesson taped on a video-tape machine. Secondly, I had the opportunity to observe and be observed by one of my peers.

The opportunity to work with another as a team.

Good communication with cooperating teacher--she was always willing to listen, offer suggestions and constructive comments.

The cooperation of the teachers at the school in the grade level I was teaching. They gave constructive criticism and suggestions about my lessons.

My experiences with the children--working with them and sharing in their enthusiasm of learning new things.

Being on my own. Working with small groups instruction.

The friendly atmosphere of the Math Office. The cooperative attitude of my cooperating teachers.

3. What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly disliked?

The fact that no one said how I could improve or what I was doing particularly well.

I extremely disliked the mouthiness and utter disrespect some of these students have for their teachers.

Seminars (especially the ones in Kent).

The room that I had to work in. It was far too small.

The lack of control and respect for others of some students.

Not enough criticism from my critic teacher.

There should be better rules layed down for both student teacher and supervising teacher. There was too much comparison between what other student teachers and their supervising teacher were doing.

Nothing, except I would like to spend the entire day there, not half days.

Dividing my time in and out of school between two co-operating teachers.

I am the only male in the school. Teachers don't seem to trust me.

Not enough time to prepare lessons because detailed lesson plans were required in the beginning.

The teacher I worked with did not give me enough information about my mistakes.

Students would not accept reprimands from a student teacher; the team teacher had to reprimand them.

Principal's attitude toward some of us.

The first 2 weeks were disorganized and very confusing. We observed before we knew just what to observe.

Some teachers who we were not working with liked to take advantage of student teachers.

The university's part in it.

There wasn't anything I totally disliked. Writing the lesson plans took time, but they are a value to me now.

Only in the last week did I really feel that the class saw me as a teacher. I think the experience should be extended so that the student teacher may have the responsibility of full time teaching for several weeks.

(Continuation of)
3. What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly disliked?

The seminars which could and should have been a very helpful experience were a total waste of time. The same person directed the entire series and literally talked the entire seminar about her experiences, teaching forms, qualifications, etc.

Having to emulate our critic teachers to be considered a "good teacher". Having to act like an authority figure.

The attitude of the students.

Immaturity of many of the children, belligerent attitude of some children towards school, constant feeling of exhaustion on part of student teacher.

At times it became discouraging, when the students were not paying attention to a lesson which I had worked long and hard preparing.

Lack of respect shown by the pupils to student teachers.

Soem of the teachers and administrators hardly recognized student teachers as an asset to their staff.

Not being able to get immediate and frequent feedback and evaluation.

Too informal to begin with. Personally, I must be forced into habit of organization.

Being charged $376.00 by John Carroll for it--I feel that that is blatant thievery! I also feel that student teachers should be paid for their services.

I didn't like being constantly watched although I know it was important to be observed and criticized. I didn't like driving 30 miles a day.

Sometimes it seemed we were just students or teacher's aides doing menial work. There were too many people to please.

The center I was in was too large for the school.

Preparation--lesson plans--time consuming.

The grade I was assigned had been a discipline problem for many years and many teachers; some people involved seemed to think that I should have solved a problem existing for some time before I even entered the classroom.

There should have been more opportunities to share with other student teachers the experiences we were having at the Seminars on Monday evenings.

I disliked having my planned lessons disrupted or suddenly changed because of a movie or some other unexpected activity.

(Continuation of)
3. What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly disliked?

Too long! We get out of school May 15 and I have to stay until June 15.

The spoiled attitude of some of the pupils.

All the preparation needed.

My cooperating teacher. A very nervous, unself-confident, and uncooperative person. She never had a student teacher before and had only three years teaching experience herself, with no graduate work either.

Not having as much freedom as I would have liked though I do realize some controls are necessary. In addition, I had difficulty readjusting to the regulations of high school.

The frustration of being ill-prepared in Methods.

Lesson plans (detailed).

Lesson plan cards in detail in the beginning. The class not really being my own.

I don't think I was prepared enough as to materials and methods.

I disliked switching supervising teachers and students half-way through the quarter. I enjoyed working with both teachers but I think five weeks with each class is too little time for active involvement.

I didn't get to work individually with the children as I thought I would be able to.

Not enough observation of my classes; little help from cooperating teacher or supervisor.

One thing I disliked at the time was the 3 weeks of merely observing. It was terribly boring. I also was dismayed because I found myself teaching subject areas for which I was not well prepared.

Was somewhat disorganized (a new center) at the beginning of the quarter.

I have 15 yrs. of actual classroom teaching experience. I do not see any reason why--with this long experience-- one should do student teaching. And why not in ones' own school?

I disliked the fact that there was a lack of time to talk with the teachers after a school day.

Having to write such detailed lesson plans.

(Continuation of)
3. What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly disliked?

Other class assignments for courses taken at the beginning of the semester at the college were due during student teaching time. This detracted from the amount of time able to be spent on teaching. Seminars held on Mon. afternoon so that we had to leave our schools early. It was difficult to plan lessons for the week not being there all day on Monday.

Too little time to talk with cooperating teacher; never enough time to carry out extended projects with students (because of 1/2 day schedule); lack of professionalism among teachers, total school atmosphere could turn off any desire to do good job!

Supervising large groups of children during teacher planning sessions. We were not given suggestions on how to cope with the behavior problems.

The superivsing teacher did not give me enough freedom and independence. She was in the room too much.

I disliked the feeling of having to please or put on a good show for my critic teacher and others who would recommend me highly or pass judgement on me in any way.

I have one critic teacher who does not give me help. He strikes me and other people as someone who wants student teachers to lessen his work load. Perhaps the teachers themselves need to be screened. The other 6 student teachers and myself also find our seminar leaders and supervisor a very negative influence.

Having to leave for seminars all the time.

The detailed time-consuming lesson plans.

Detailed lesson plans.

Attending seminars at the college. It took away from my time with the children. It was a total waste of time.

I disliked it when the teacher was constantly in the room. It made me very nervous.

I found it difficult to have my lessons prepared to hand in 24 hours in advance.

I thought the time spent writing detailed lesson plans for every subject was very unprofitable.

Pressure--but that's necessary--and part of life!

Assignments were still due for course taken the first six weeks of school.

Writing so many formal lesson plans--I thought it was unnecessary in some subject areas.

(Continuation of)
3. What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly disliked?

Detailed lesson plans.

The obvious existence of a class structure with teachers and students in different classes, distinguished by dress, behavior, and regulations which differentiated between the two.

12. Have you suggested changes in the student teacher system?
    If yes, what was the response?

Not having seminars at Kent. (Could just as easily have had them in the west Cleveland area).

Student teachers should not be placed with 1st or 2nd year teachers. If a teacher does not want a student teacher, one should not be forced on her.

Difficulties in implementation were pointed out to me.

Complete authority (without another teacher) in the classroom. Two heads are not always better than one.

Stress of lesson plans for the college should be less.

A different person is in charge of the seminars. Although the person now taking charge is far from what should be. I feel there is improvement.

Complained that students under the center head as their critic teacher had no objective person to go to with problems.

Shorten the length of student teaching experience. 18 weeks is not necessary.

Suggested that I have more responsibility--Positive response.

Those teachers who don't want a student teacher shouldn't get one.

John Carroll has a new program and it would not be fair to name them. Anything which would help is greatly accepted at John Carroll.

To whom does one suggest these changes? I'd like to re-vamp the entire system.

Very favorable! In fact, in the school system I'm at, we have a steering committee who handles problems, and some changes have been made by them concerning student teaching problems.

More directed action at the beginning, not just random observing. More structured at beginning.

The changes were discussed and agreed upon but cannot be implemented.

I was involved in a center where they wanted criticism to better the program. All suggestions were welcomed.

Getting with a good cooperating teacher. More supervision and help from college supervisor.

We will have but have not yet had the chance to suggest changes.

I preferred working within one grade level in all subjects instead of changing grades. This was granted.

(Continuation of)
12. Have you suggested changes in the student teacher system?
    If yes, what was the response?

Well dear we'll see what we can do, but as you know there are only 10 wks. of class before student teaching and if we extended student teaching then what would happen to class time?

Less time required.

Beachwood is attempting to begin paying student teachers instead of using them for free. I totally agree.

Though this school is tremendous, its location is too far from University.

Minimal.

I was listened to but I'm not sure if that will help when it comes to making changes.

Positive. The cooperating teachers are really interested in training professionals and are open to reasonable suggestions. However, the University Education Dept. is more rigid.

Very willing to listen to suggestions and new ideas.

Abolish it. It should not be compulsory for persons with more than 8-10 yrs. of teaching experience.

Changes and suggestions made to supervisor were accepted well and encouraged--supposedly these suggestions are to be looked into for next year.

No other classes should be taken while interning. More specific demonstrations of actual lessons before doing it oneself. University personnel should observe more to keep up with what schools are really like.

I would have liked more suggestions in teaching reading and morning visitations to other classrooms during the time when reading was taught.

I would have it longer and in conjunction with the methods courses. I believe we would get more from both this way.

People listened--don't know if they'll be used.

I taught 16 years before doing student teaching and didn't feel it was necessary. I think perhaps about 2 weeks would have been enough.

Requested a more useful seminar. No response.
Student teaching in second semester for future students - acted upon.

Perhaps the college could affiliate with Public Schools - and student teaching experience if preferred - could be done in a public school.

(Continuation of)
12. Have you suggested changes in the student teacher system?
If yes, what was the response?

I suggested closer supervision for students having problems "We'll try harder next time."

17. If you could change the system what would it be?

It would be an internship for a year where you would get paid a small fee.

That student teachers be more prepared in practical matters before stepping into the classroom.

Change the school to a suburban one for future student teachers.

More written rules explaining the program for both student teacher and cooperating teacher. (I was lucky).

People considering student teaching for a semester should be forced to try it for a month or so in their earlier years of college.

Less wasted "structured" time in students' schedules.
No study halls. In addition I would like to see courses meet 2 or 3 days a week 50-75 minutes instead of EVERYDAY for only 40 minutes.

Make it freer--Kids have no rights, they could be more responsible.

Student teaching should be offered earlier than Senior year because if a person finds out they don't enjoy teaching, they're left in a bad situation.

Arrange classrooms into levels so a more homogeneous group would be together. This also lends itself to individualized instruction.

Change the conception that teachers must have absolutely quiet classrooms and control over their pupils and change students' stereotyped image of what a teacher looks like or is.

To have a more practical experience before going into the classroom--in reference to education courses.

To have experience in both a structured classroom situation and an open-classroom situation.

I would suggest earlier exposure to teaching. That is, some experience in teaching while still a Fr., Soph., Jr., rather than being thrown into it all at once.

One year experience for student teachers.

I wouldn't change my class at all.

In 25 words or less?!
More freedom, less grade emphasis. In English more emphasis on development of sensitivity rather than assigned amount to cover--Don't push romantic poetry down 18 year olds!

(Continuation of)
17. If you could change the system what would it be?

What system? "Teacher Education" should be changed completely. Our educational system (in general) needs so much work I wouldn't know where to start.

Group children more accurately according to level of ability.

I really can't forsee any changes I would like to make.

Able to teach a number of different classes during student teaching other than those taught by cooperating teacher as in Business. Example 3 wks shorthand, 3 wks. bookkeeping, 3 wks. Gen. Bus., 1 wk. typing.

Let the student teacher know more about where he will be teaching.

Upgraded classes with more stress on developing reading and communication skills.

Cut down size of classes. More individualization.

Observations to be made by both college and teacher supervisors of particular lessons and evaluations compared. Principal should not be allowed to participate in evaluations unless he/she has observed them.

I wouldn't change the system in any way.

As of now, I would not change the system. My reason is because my cooperating teacher and myself get along very well.

Student teaching should be longer. A required teaching experience should be set up for every student in the junior year.

I don't understand what is meant by "the system". It won't change the way the university has "abandoned" the student teachers.

Non-graded system would be a greater help to all the students.

Increase student teaching on a full time basis for at least a period of a month.

No outside assignments during teaching experience; longer period of time. (We only had 6 weeks).

Make attendance optional. (It already is in some of the grades in Concept I)

Ambiguous question--which system?

The teachers that have been gainfully employed should not have to leave their classrooms to do student teaching.

(Continuation of)
17. If you could change the system what would it be?

I would like to see higher standards for choosing the cooperating teacher involved. My college offers a variety of pre-student teaching experiences, which are good preparations. Other colleges might adopt this idea.

Less regulations. More faith in honesty and responsibility of a high school student.

Give the student more of an opportunity to work on different grade levels.

Fewer detailed lesson plans.

More teamwork--teacher and student teacher working with individuals in class simultaneously.

More chances to observe so-called expert teachers.

Good question. I could write a book on it. What do you mean by "the system" (student teaching?, total school system?, the particular system I'm in?)

What system? The school system I student taught in or the student teacher program.

To try to individualize the curriculum to a greater extent.

Longer observation of classes before I took over; more help from cooperating teacher.

Eliminate the seminars and have weekly sessions in the particular schools with both teachers and student teachers in the program.

I would have the cooperating teacher know she is allowed to give the student teacher room for experimentation on different ideas. (Which I understand is now frowned upon.)

I feel it would at first be necessary to work in a school, gain a little background and experience before I would want to change it (the system).

Immediately clear up the vast misconceptions in educational circles of what "open classrooms" and "flexible" classrooms are! It's turning into blackboard jungles because the professionals still don't know what it's all about.

I would not consistently have student teachers in the same school every quarter.

(Continuation of)
17. If you could change the system what would it be?

I would suggest spending full days out at school for a shorter period of time rather than the extending semester half day program.

The disappointments I feel with student teaching are solely due to the inadequacies of the school system in general--over-worked teachers; atmosphere of suspicion between teachers and students.

Have more changes made so curriculum wouldn't have to be followed so exactly.

More independence.

No student teaching after 10 years of teaching.

More useful seminar -- full semester Student Teaching.

I would change it from a traditional school to a Pod school.

It was difficult to prepare lesson plans 24 hours in advance. It was unfair that some teachers demanded this and others didn't.

A more creative academic atmosphere for the child--also much more individual study.

I would like students at this college to have more than 6 weeks for student teaching. Next year they'll spend 10 weeks in student teaching.

Experience with not only self contained classrooms but with team teaching-open classroom, etc.

Lengthen student teaching.
Include experiences observing and if possible, teaching a wider range of grades.
Experiences in non-graded and team teaching situation.

I'd change the monetary setup. Right now, we pay the university $1300 so that we can teach. I'd like to know where it goes.

26. How has your concept of a teacher been altered? If so, how?

I think I've realized what a great responsibility it is to be a good teacher and how time-consuming it is.

Yes, I've learned a teacher has to learn to let a lot of things "slide off her back."

A teacher is many different personalities and professions rolled into one.

There is a lot more extra work than just teaching. I spent a lot of money on extra materials for classes.

I relize how difficult it is to prepare lessons and to stimulate classes.

Teachers have more responsibility than I thought.

I feel as if there's a larger responsibility on my shoulders. Fortunately since I really wanted to teach and still do, that added "responsibility" is welcomed and anticipated.

Teachers do not practice what they preach. "Stick" kids in double-bind situations.

A teacher plays many roles. For example: disciplinarian, policeman, housekeeper, manager, mother, psychologist, etc. I didn't realize what a great responsibility it really calls for.

The individual initiative of the teacher seems to determine the effectiveness of her teaching. It is a very time consuming job and I find that some teachers really cheating in amount of time spent in preparation.

High school students had idea that all teachers are old and mean. I'm not. They don't accept that (me). A teacher becomes more of a disciplinarian than I envisioned.

The student-teacher relationship has definitely changed.

More discipline and less actual teaching.

It involves a lot more training and more preparation than I had expected. There are many techniques to learn.

Some teachers do more than necessary but have fantastic classes and others do little work (which surprised me) and have very dull classes.

My idea of a teacher is not so idealic. Children have changed and sophisticated more than I remember.

I can understand a lot ~~of~~ frustrations I have seen before that I hadn't really understood. I can see that it's easy to get carried away on some big ego trip--and I think that a lot of people are.

I have less fear of controlling a class as far as discipline is concerned.

(Continuation of)
26. How has your concept of a teacher been altered? If so, how?

Yes, they do more planning than I expected.

I realize the need for flexibility in a teacher.

I realize now how serious a responsibility a teacher really has to create a learning atmosphere in her room.

In methods classes we were always studying about the perfect, normal classroom, not so in reality.

Yes, more preparation is needed than I previously thought they did.

Education courses lead one to believe teachers are precision operating instructors--working with 4 teachers I realized that a good teacher does not assume the appearance of precision teacher.

I have realized how much I really want to teach.

Teachers have to alter their methods to cater to the whims of the principal.

Having more experiences in the basic thing that has helped; must learn to cope with all types of problems.

My concept has not been altered. I want to be a teacher even more now!

The amount of work involved and versatility necessary is more than I'd have imagined.

I never realized fully the great responsibility a teacher has and the influence she has on her students. Now I have a better understanding of this.

There seems to be more paper work involved than I before thought.

I realize more now than I did before that being a teacher is more than just getting across subject matter; it's a 24-hour job.

Teacher must be more prepared than I thought.

I am much more impressed with the demands and difficulties of being a good teacher.

Much more undisciplined here. No teacher dress code.

I realize that the teacher must be willing to give of herself completely.

Teacher must be prepared to meet and adapt to practical situations; ideal text book situations not real.

(Continuation of)
26. How has your concept of a teacher been altered? If so, how?

Only in that the kids are less willing to learn and study than I expected.

Yes, a teacher also has to be a clerk -- you have much paperwork.

My concept of a teacher remains the same as before--a teacher's purpose is to help children to benefit from all the experiences our life has to offer.

I think that some teachers should have better rapport with their children. They don't seem to understand how children feel.

I thought it would be easier to establish a good student to teacher relationship.

The alteration has been on a personal level. Before student teaching I thought it would be too dull a career. Now I find it exciting.

I see now the wide diversity of skills, perceptions, sensitivities, and knowledge a teacher must have.

None! It is still a very important job, to my way of thinking, and I still think there are very few good ones. However, I now see specifically how difficult it is to be good!

I have found that it is not a job you can walk away from but one you take home with you.

I now see a teacher as much more than a teacher of a certain subject. She has many more jobs and needs to fulfill between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.

I thought it would be a lot easier to be myself in the classroom, but the role of teacher (a distance largely created by grading and set curriculum) creates a barrier I hadn't expected.

A teacher must be more flexible.

Much more work than I realized if you wish to do a good job.

Her job is much more than subject matter. Her after class hours and her relationship with the children are very important.

I now realize the extreme importance of being a "real" person to children--taking interest in each individual and keeping the enthusiasm and encouragement level high.

There are many subtle ways a teacher should use her authority so as to get children to cooperate.

Yes, as one, you finally realize just how human teachers are.

31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

I am in the gifted program and I was told it was the closest place to my hometown.

No choice - The university put me here and I knew about the school and that I wouldn't mind being here.

I was placed there.

I feel that it was a challenge.

I wanted the opportunity of student teaching in a fairly structured type of classroom.

We had a choice between a pod school or a more traditional school. After observing the pod I knew it wasn't for me.

I thought, after observation, that the three teachers I worked under were the best I observed in the system.

Because I liked the faculty that was teaching there and the school was fairly close for six weeks of commuting.

I wanted to student teach and was given no choice as to place.

It's a nice school and the faculty seemed very nice.

Because I knew I had to student teach somewhere!

No real choice--assignment was late.

Teachers are friendly and work well together and with the principal. Children are interesting.

I was given a choice between a pod school or the more traditional type, which is where I am. I chose this because I felt much more secure in this type school.

It was conveniently located and had a good reputation as far as faculty-student rapport and very good cooperating teachers.

I wanted to teach--the particular shcool was not our choice.

It was a suburban school, with a good reputation. Also it is close to home.

Did not want other teaching site.

One does not have much choice. It was one of the few schools that the university uses for their science program.

(Continuation of)
31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

Because of its flexibility in structure and new educational ideas and concepts which are actually put into practice.

Because I thought a Pod School would be a challenge.

The school put me there.

Private academy appealed to me as offering both traditional and innovative teaching methods, smaller classes for greater student-teacher rapport.

I wanted to experience the open school situation--I had decided a long time ago that the "traditional" setting held little for either students or myself.

I agreed to student teach in this school because I had no other choice. However, I enjoyed being here.

Because I like the idea of an open school.

I thought it would give me a broader base of experience.

It was close to my home and the school system is a very good one.

It was where I lived at home and the system I attended. I was familiar with it.

Closest to home; new school; new equipment.

Because I like the idea of working in an open school.

It is an open-education system and I feel the experience will prepare for any teaching situation--I will be able to be more open in a closed-situation.

I liked the structure. The school routine is very flexible and changing classes is a great system.

I was not given the opportunity to agree to my being placed in this school.

Convenient location - near home. Other student teachers to work with.

I was forced to because of Kent--but this particular school within the system was great. I was able to do 1/2 day.

Since I do not drive it was for convenience, the location of the school, being near my home.

I have done two co-op jobs at the school and I really did enjoy working with the faculty.

I wanted to teach in a center and I knew this school was good.

(Continuation of)
31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

Because it was the only school that the university approved of that had a majority black pupil population.

Intermediate grades were available and location was good.

Primarily because of good bus connections even though I did take 2 buses to get there. Also I was interested in the community the school is situated in.

Because I knew or was familiar with the school before. Also it had the grade level I was hoping to teach (grade 5).

Agreed because there was no other place I could have done student teaching.

I didn't care where I went, it was the first place on the list.

I had no choice.

School was close to where I lived; the grade I wanted was offered.

No choice.

A list of schools and grade levels was posted; we each put down 3 choices--first come, first served. I chose this school simply because I was unfamiliar with all the schools and a friend told me where this school was located.

Close to home and the neighborhood was similar to my own--same economic status.

It was the most convenient in terms of travel and time.

Grade level and location was suitable.

Because of location.

Knew it was a good school; also, no choice.

It was assigned to me!

Heard of the cooperating teacher.

It was the center for my major field.

Location.

It was the only school with an appropriate grade level that was offered and was still fairly close by.

All math student teachers from my university had to come to this school.

The school was close to my home and convenient to home.

(Continuation of)
31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

Middle class suburban school; one in which I felt I could perform and learn effectively.

I was assigned there.

It was the closest to my home.

I had no choice--but I agreed because of the school's excellent reputation.

It is the school system closest to my home that is active in the student teaching program.

Because I wanted a public school either urban or suburban.

I had to student-teach to become certified.

I was not aware that I had any choice. All history teachers from CWRU teach in the Shaker system.

Was not given a choice.

I was given no choice.

Because of its convenience; and its philosophy of education.

Suburban type school for basic background and because of easy accessibility transportation wise.

I had done a semester of field work with these students and became interested in them, their problems, interests, and progression. A tough class; felt it would give me varied experiences.

I chose to student teach in a pod school because I desired the experience of working in this type of school.

My school was close to home and it was a student teaching center.

My university set up a center in the school system and it was supposed to be very helpful to work there.

I was educated in the traditional schools and I wanted to have an experience in the more progressive type school so as to be able to make intelligent comparisons between the two.

All those in English placed at this school. It's high reputation made it agreeable.

I like 1st Grade because I love the age group and enthusiasm of the children at that age.

(Continuation of)
31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

I wanted to teach while living at home.

Inner city experience.

Because I wanted a suburban school and it was close to my home. It also had the grade level I wanted.

I was assigned to the school. I only had a choice in the grade level.

It is my home parish.

I did not have a choice.

School administration and teachers willing to have and cooperate with student teachers.

Nice school, nice surrounding, ideal education situation.

32. Is it as you thought? How so? How not?

I've never been in a pod school so I did not really know what to expect-it seemed like complete chaos until I was there a couple of weeks.

Somewhat. Kids are still kids and they forget things easily. However, more freedom is allowed now and it takes some getting used to.

I didn't know what it would be like.

No, the children had many more personal problems than I imagined.

Self-contained classrooms. More secure.

Yes, these three worked extremely well alone or together. This was not a pod school but a regular one using open ideas.

No, It was a much more wonderful experience than I thought it would be.

Yes--I went to a very similar school. The only difference is that is much richer--more facilities.

Very much so. Teaching environment is very good.

Expected more open to ideas.

Yes, altho I was awakened more to the wide variety of individuals and personalities a teacher encounters in her classroom. It's a real challenge!

On my experience I was very happy with my choice. Even the principal showed a real interest in my work.

I envisioned the students as much more radical and mature than they seem to be. The school policies are more liberal than I had thought.

No. Students no longer show the same respect they did when I went to school.

I really came into it not thinking about what it would be like, but rather being open to accept anything.

Yes, because whatever course a teacher decides to teach in his or her area he is permitted with any possible method.

At first I thought it to be confusing but ORGANIZATION is the key.

I had not a real idea.

Somewhat--A little more provincial than I thought.

Pretty much, although I am far more encouraged than I have ever been before. It's even better than I had hoped.

(Continuation of)
32. Is it as you thought? How so? How not?

I thought I could never stand in front of a class and control and teach at the same time, but I did.

It is better than I thought, the students receive a better education and the teachers work together.

Yes, I was exposed to 3 grade levels.

Yes, it turned out to be as good as I thought it would be--the school has modern techniques.

General students behavior is quite different than expected, attitude, language used etc.

It was more structured in subject areas.

The atmosphere is more relaxed than I thought a schools' would be which I really like.

I expected to feel more like a teacher, not like a student taking another college course.

Yes, lots of interaction with student teachers--share ideas--problems.

In Kindergarten at another school which was also an excellent experience. These schools were both what I expected.

The school is as I thought; a very cheery and cozy place. Everyone was very pleasant during my six weeks.

Yes because of my two co-op jobs. While on co-op, I worked in different classrooms helping the teachers and children.

Yes, it was a good school and all of the teachers were excellent.

The facilities are better than I'd have thought but other things are the same.

Tension of doing student teaching eased considerably after meeting the people with whom I was to be associated with.

Lack of professional conduct and downright un-Christian attitude on part of some teachers in a Catholic school.

Yes, it was on a departmental scheduling and I had experience, as a result of student teaching, of teaching in both a self-contained and departmental situation.

Yes--a lot of hard work that was extremely beneficial. A lot of flops that I learned by.

(Continuation of)
32. Is it as you thought? How so? How not?

As sophisticated, progressive, and heterogeneous as I expected.

No. It was much better than I anticipated.

Yes. It is very progressive in courses offered and disciplined classrooms.

Much better than I thought.

I was slightly familiar with the school beforehand. But it was much larger than I expected. Otherwise, it was like I thought it would be.

Kids are not as intelligent or motivated as I expected. However, they are far better behaved than I had anticipated.

Yes, it is as I thought it would be.

Pretty much, except the students are less motivated than I expected.

It was the same as teaching in all private schools where I have taught.

Yes, except the classes are very overcrowded.

I had no particular stereotyped ideas of what the school would be like.

The teachers were much more strict than I had expected.

Yes. All of the workers and families, and faculty work together for the good of the children.

Yes. Seeing growth and development and building trust and respect, has shown me the satisfactions I can hope for in the profession.

I liked the concept but the wasted time and lack of self-control of the children surprised me.

The system was very good and most of the people in it were willing to be of help.

Yes it was as I thought in an overall respect. Although the subject area of Math in which I am working is different. The program is rather structured, the approach and methods are rather similar regardless of subject material.

No. The alternative education programs are undermined by administration and staff.

I had pretty much the same idea.

Much nicer than I thought. More Cooperative.

(Continuation of)
32. Is it as you thought? How so? How not?

Yes. In a lot of ways this traditional school is like the one I went to.

This school was very traditionally run.

Student teaching was a very positive and enriching experience.

Yes. A lot of work and not much free time.

No - better--I worked with small group instruction in language arts and math.

Basically. The Math Dept. is more organized and a closer knit group than I had expected.

It's much better than I thought it would be. The kids were actively involved in their school life which was afforded by the set-up of the system.

Not really--in a Lakewood school and middle-class area I expected the children to be more respectful of authority.

Everything I thought it was it was.

Yes it was as I thought it would be. The children responded nicely, the co-operating teacher helped when necessary.

33. Has your concept of kids changed? If YES, how?

See them now as less sophisticated, less aware of and decided about themselves than I had expected.

Very media oriented - want entertainment. Since saturated with video tapes, records, etc. - harder to reach.

I entered student teaching thinking that if I were fair and nice to the students they would treat me fairly also. But I found that they take advantage every chance they get.

I didn't realize how much children are different now than when I was that age.

I never really knew the social problems which they are involved in at such an early age and the friends they need.

I realize kids can learn in many ways and the lecture is probably the least effective.

Only confirmed my opinion that they need to be treated more respectfully, humanly, but also more firmly.

I still think that they are extremely creative and interesting people.

Children today seem to have far depper problems and interests than I remembered.

I realize that they have feelings and are also individuals capable of making their own choices.

I didn't realize how knowledgeable six and seven year olds are, nor how creative.

I have four of my own so I knew children well before coming into this experience.

I never realized how much they can achieve if they are given challenges. I also found their excitement and enthusiasm a very rewarding experience.

I never realized they were so disrespectful. I also never realized how enthusiastic and uninhibited they are in the classroom.

Kids have a very short attention span, and it is very difficult to keep them interested during a whole class period.

Kids are much more advanced and mature today. They also are very spoiled and demand things more.

Need a lot more help in "growing up".

(Continuation of)
33. Has your concept of kids changed? If YES, how?

These kids were very spoiled and they didn't appreciate some of the things that were prepared. This might be typical of many children but when I worked with inner-city children I got much more satisfaction from it.

They are more sophisticated. They know more. Just their idea of sex and the fact they know has changed.

Although kids today, I thought, might be more open to listen but don't seem to be. Just as closed as ever.

Just in the sense that I am amazed increasingly more each day at what "kids" can understand and handle academically.

I've found they are extremely easy to work with because they want to prove themselves and they want praise from their teacher.

I understand the way their minds work a little better now.

They are not as easy to handle as I first thought. The teacher must be forceful in order to get anything accomplished by students.

You can help most of them with friendship.

They are more verbal than I expected.

Kids will always be kids - maybe only growing more sophisticated at their ages.

The third graders I have and all of the children in the school seem more mature, in many ways, than I expected.

They are really capable of doing and learning so much more than I thought they could.

34. Has your concept of yourself changed? If YES, How?

My weaknesses have been laid wide open and my preference for 1 to 1 relationships has been made clearer.

I know now that I have the ability to do more than [illegible] and teach children day in and day out.

Positive!

I feel more qualified and confident.

I am sure I am a good teacher.

Through the experience of Student Teaching I have learned much about myself and have gained much confidence.

I now have more confidence in myself.

I am more confident of my teaching ability.

Now confident in my teaching experience.

More self-confident before a class--begin to realize more the role and person of a teacher.

I feel I am much more definite in the feelings I have on how I would run my classroom.

I have gained confidence in myself and have finally succeeded at something.

I am more confident that I have something to offer and can be competent.

In the respect, that now I know I can teach effectively instead of just thinking that I would be able to.

I thought I could be the strict disciplinarian and still be respected but I'm learning differently.

I wasn't sure if I had heart to follow through with a punishment threat--but I learned.

I've learned that I have to be more patient and stricter with some kids.

I never thought I would make it through student teaching but I did.

I have taken a second look at my past teaching experiences and have already tried to improve.

Though I am usually a more articulate person, I get very nervous in front of kids.

I feel I need more experience in teaching.

(Continuation of)
34. Has your concept of yourself changed? If YES, How?

I thought I could get along better with people (that I disagree with).

I can be more sensitive to others.

I realize I need to learn to acquire a little more patience concerning discipline. I also realize I will be a good teacher soon.

I feel less capable than I had thought I was.

I am now sure that I would really like to be a teacher.

I think I am more self confident.

I feel that I really have a lot to offer people, especially children and I feel more confident in myself.

Teaching is much more difficult and more of a challenge than what I realized. I found that I was weak in many areas. I thought I wouldn't be.

I have found I am more patient and creative than I realized.

I am sure now that the children respond to me as much as I had hoped they would.

I saw how important it was for me to be patient, challenging and really care about each individual. Only then did I find myself getting response for all children.

I find I have much more patience than I imagined. I also found that, other than content material, I was ill-prepared for this experience.

I realize that to become a good teacher takes effort, it comes naturally to only a few people. Others have to work at it, like me.

I've realized that I'm much more patient than I thought. Also that I need to be careful in not getting too personally involved with students.

A lot firmer than I thought I would be.

Teaching is constant learning and planning on my part in order to be successful.

I thought I had more patience and was more creative.

Expected to be much more difficult. Unfortunately I find myself trying to "win" kids--I have to find a balance.

43. (1) Comments about this questionnaire or items on it.

I don't understand the purpose behind this questionnaire. Could it be used to change certain deficiencies?

I would have preferred to answer this questionnaire after I had completed my student teaching experience.

Mine was a wonderful experience. I just wish that some of the younger student teachers had not had as bad experiences as they related to me. Perhaps more could be done through their years of training to acquaint them with children.

Much of this questionnaire is quite vague--I've indicated specific questions already.

It was okay. It seemed to be pretty thorough.

I would like to know what you're going to do with this data. I have a feeling it will get filed and forgotten.

Good--A learning experience for me.

I'm glad this questionnaire was handed out because altho I was very happy with my student teaching experience, I know that there are others who had many gripes and I'm glad that they have the chance to express them to someone who has enough authority to try and better the situation wherever it is necessary.

Some questions leave no middle ground. Scales are difficult because many questions have two sides--bad and good. To choose one answer is presenting wrong image.

Given too soon.

I hope that it evaluates what you want it to. Having a self-addressed, stamped envelope encouraged me to complete this questionnaire--Good idea.

Very reasonable questions in which one constantly contemplates during his teaching experiences.

Quite thorough and good.

Many questions are difficult to evaluate. It is hard to express many things.

I tend to look disparagingly on all surveys especially education ones altho I admit the necessity of improving education and I suppose this is an attempt to begin but quest. 17 seemed typical (of same)--come on that would take years and pages and much thought and discussion. Too often educators esp. those not teaching become too involved in fine theory and other hypothetical studies when in service practical application is most important.

(Continuation of)
43. (1) Comments about this questionnaire or items on it.

What will you change as a result of this?

Good, easy to answer. Did not have to labor over every question.

Some yes and no answers should be qualified as to the way the respondent is answering question--another alternative could be "sometimes".

Terms such as "kids" and "flunky" don't sound very good.

#17 what system? Some questions cannot be answered with a definite yes or no.

The questionnaire is well set up. The only questions which I had to reread was 43 c, d. Having one's mind on the present schools, the word attended reminded me of my own formal education.

Excellent idea, but what will be the end result of it?

On question 17, I wasn't sure whether you meant the system at the school I was teaching at or the system set-up at the college regarding student teaching.

Seems like questions that are important individually but when completed in a questionnaire defeat the purpose.

I am interested in results, I found many items (5, 9) difficult to answer with choices provided. Because our time is equally divided between two teachers and my responses would therefore be extremely different.

It is extremely vague and I would like to see the conclusions you draw.

Some questions are ambiguous.

I thought it was very easy to fill out.

Some items were hard to answer because of having 3 cooperating teachers rather than 1.

Some of your questions were vague--you should be a little more specific. If you really want to improve the quality of education on all levels you should spend more time interviewing teachers, student-teachers and students.

I appreciate any opportunity to reveal how inadequately prepared teachers are by the universities. My success has been because I am a parent and have had some experience with children and schools.

Many of the questions in this questionnaire are extremely vague. I left some blank because the question was not clear to me. Also because I am presently student teaching in an open classroom many of the questions didn't really apply to me. I would be interested in hearing some of the results!

(Continuation of)
43. (1) Comments about this questionnaire or items on it.

Due to the system of St. John some of these questions were difficult to answer, because the schools are usually suburban parochial.

I hope it helps to improve teacher training.

I thought the questionnaire was fairly well compiled and set up in a manner that makes answering as simple as possible.

More specific questions about critic teachers needed.

I hope you can find this information useful in some way!

I was happy to fill this out.

Some of the questions are difficult to answer. For example, number 32 was difficult.

I felt that my teaching experience was different than that of other student teachers in the same school in that I had taught as a full time teacher for three years prior to my student teaching experience.

Well-made and balanced questionnaire.

I feel some of the yes/no questions could have been stated to include a selection of (somewhat) or (sometimes).

Good idea if real effort is made to make some progressive changes in teacher education.

You didn't ask about pre-student teaching experience-i.e. block.
You did not ask for ways to improve seminars or methods courses or what was wrong.
Glad everything required short answers.
Please recommend to member colleges that they survey seniors after student teaching to get feedback about student teaching and methods courses.

APPENDIX F

Coordinator Questionnaire

DIRECTIONS: Complete as soon as possible after receipt and return to Questionnaire Project, Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, 1367 E. 6th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44114.

1. How many student teachers are you responsible for per term? ______

2. How many cooperating teachers are you responsible for per term? ______

3. Have you had any course work, workshop or formal training on being a coordinator? ( ) YES ( ) NO
   If yes; How would you rate the usefulness of the training?
   ( ) Extremely helpful
   ( ) Somewhat helpful
   ( ) Not at all helpful

4. What percentage of your time is spent on duties related to student teachers and/or cooperating teachers?
   ( ) 0 - 20%
   ( ) 20 - 40%
   ( ) 40 - 60%
   ( ) 60 - 80%
   ( ) 80 -100%

5. Do you engage in any of the following teacher training activities?

	YES	NO
a. Teach any courses at a college or university	( )	( )
b. Plan the in-service programs in your school related to student teaching	( )	( )
c. Implement the in-service programs in your school related to student teaching	( )	( )
d. Hold seminars for student teachers	( )	( )
e. Hold seminars for cooperating teachers	( )	( )
f. Provide in-service training not related to student teaching	( )	( )

6. Have you suggested changes in the teacher preparation system?
   ( ) YES ( ) NO If yes; What was the response?

____

____

____

7. What changes in the teacher preparation system, would you make if you could?

____

____

____

8. Is your supervisory work part of graduate studies or some other program for which you are not paid. ( ) YES ( ) NO If No, by whom are you paid for your services?
   College or universities _____%
   School District _____%

9. Do you assign student teachers to cooperating teachers?
   ( ) YES ( ) NO If not; Who does ____________________

10. Were others expectations of you made clear before you began?
   ( ) YES ( ) NO

11. Do the college or university and the school have a mechanism for cooperatively determining general policy?
   ( ) YES ( ) NO If yes; To what extent is it useful.
   ( ) Extremely useful
   ( ) Somewhat useful
   ( ) Not at all useful

12. How were cooperating teachers chosen, and by whom? ____________________

13. Which colleges or universities send student teachers to you?

   1. __________________________
   2. __________________________
   3. __________________________

14. What one major thing could the colleges or universities do to help you be more effective in your job?

____

____

____

15. What one major thing could your school do to help you be more effective in your job?

____

____

____

16. What one major thing could you do to help you be more effective in your job?

____

____

____

17. What type of school are you involved with?

( ) Rural
( ) Suburban
( ) Urban (other than inner city)
( ) Inner city

18. Who makes the decisions about student teaching?

( ) Mainly by college or university?
( ) Mainly by school personnel?
( ) Shared approximately equally?
If shared describe how this is accomplished. ____________

____

____

____

19. Does your school have a joint college or university/school district committee? ( ) YES ( ) NO

20. Comments about this questionnaire or items on it. Include questions which should have been asked.

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

APPENDIX G

Questions for Cooperating Teachers

DIRECTIONS: Complete as soon as possible after receipt and return to Questionnaire Project, Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, 1367 E. 6th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44114.

1. Were you aware beforehand that you would have a student teacher?
   ( ) NO ( ) YES
   If yes, how many weeks before? ____ weeks.

2. Have you had any coursework, workshop or formal training on being a supervising teacher?
   ( ) YES ( ) NO If yes; How would you rate the usefulness of the training?
   ( ) Extremely helpful
   ( ) Somewhat helpful
   ( ) Not at all helpful

3. Did you ask for a student teacher?
   ( ) YES ( ) NO

4. Have you had a student teacher before?
   ( ) NO ( ) YES If yes; To what extent was your previous experience helpful?
   ( ) Extremely helpful
   ( ) Somewhat helpful
   ( ) Not at all helpful

5. Do you have on-going assistance during the student teaching term?
   ( ) YES ( ) NO If yes; What is the source of such assistance?
   ( ) College or University
   ( ) School District
   What is the nature of this assistance? ______________________________
   ____

6. How knowledgeable is your student teacher in subject matter?

   Extremely Knowledgeable ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Not at All Knowledgeable

7. How does your student teacher relate to kids?

   Relates Extremely Well ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Does Not Relate At All

8. How does your student teacher relate to adults?

   Relates Extremely Well ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Does Not Relate At All

9. For how many student teachers do you have direct responsibility? _____

10. Are there on-going training sessions for teachers who are working with student teachers?
( ) NO ( ) YES If yes; Who are they conducted by?
( ) College or University
( ) School

11. Have you suggested changes in the teacher preparation system?
( ) YES ( ) NO If yes; What was the response?

____

____

____

12. If you could change the teacher preparation system what would it be?

____

____

____

____

13. To what extent do you feel your student teacher is prepared to assume the functions of a teacher:

a. In a rural school?

Very well Prepared ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Not at All Prepared

b. In a suburban school?

Very well Prepared ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Not at All Prepared

c. In an urban school (other than inner city)?

Very well Prepared ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Not at All Prepared

d. In an inner city school?

Very well Prepared ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Not at All Prepared

14. Were others expectations of you regarding student teaching activities made clear before you began?
( ) YES ( ) NO

15. How are the expectations of your behavior regarding student teaching activities determined?

( ) Jointly by School and College/University
( ) Primarily by School
( ) Primarily by College/University

16. How are you compensated for your work with student teachers?

____

____

17. Based on your observations of the student teacher, to what extent was the student teacher prepared professionally to begin student teaching?

Very well Prepared												Not at All Prepared

18. On the average, what percentage of your school day is spent on each of the following categories:

Percent of time teaching ____ %
Percent of time working with student teacher ___%
Percent of time on other duties & activities ___%

19. How many years of teaching experience do you have? _____

20. How many years of working with student teachers do you have? ____

21. How many student teachers have you worked with? _____

22. How has your philosophy of education been changed as a result of working with a student teacher? ______________________________

____

____

23. Do you have a set schedule of experiences for the student teacher?
( ) YES ( ) NO

24. What aspects of working with student teachers do you feel you are not prepared for? ______________________________

____

____

____

25. What would be the most effective contribution the universities could make to help you be a more effective professional? ____________

____

____

____

____

26. Statistical data

a. Your age ____
b. Name of the school you are teaching in ____________
c. How would you describe the elementary and secondary schools you attended?
   ( ) Rural
   ( ) Suburban
   ( ) Urban (other than inner city)
   ( ) Inner city
d. Was the school you attended: ( ) Public? ( ) Private or Parochial?
e. What kind of school are you teaching in?
   ( ) Rural
   ( ) Suburban
   ( ) Urban (other than inner city)
   ( ) Inner city
f. Is the school you are teaching in: ( ) Public? ( ) Private or Parochial?
g. What is the approximate pupil enrollment of your school? ____
h. For elementary only: How many teachers are in your school (not counting student teachers)? ____
   For departmental structure only: How many teachers in your department? ____
i. For elementary only: How many student teachers in your school? ____
   For departmental structure only: How many student teachers in your department? ____
j. What is your college or university?
   Undergraduate: ____________
   Graduate: ____________

k. Circle the grade level(s) of your student teaching experience.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

27. Comments about this questionnaire or items on it. Include questions which should have been asked.

____

____

____

____

APPENDIX H

Student Teacher Questionnaire

DIRECTIONS: Complete as soon as possible after receipt and return to Questionnaire Project, Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, 1367 E. 6th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44114.

1. Place an "X" in the one box which best indicates how much you liked or disliked your student teaching experience. The more you disliked it, the bigger the minus number you should give it. The more you liked it the bigger the plus number you should give it.

Definitely Disliked					Neutral					Definitely Liked
-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly liked?

____

____

____

____

3. What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly disliked?

____

____

____

____

4. While doing your student teaching, did you attend seminars held by your college or university?

YES ☐ NO ☐ IF NO, GO TO Q. 5.

a. Where were they held?
- ☐ At student teaching site
- ☐ At college or university
- ☐ Other ________________________ (write in)

b. Who conducted the seminar?
- ☐ College or University Person
- ☐ School Person
- ☐ Other ________________________ (write in)

c. To what extent were you in the seminar able to share experiences with other student teachers?
( ) Heavily
( ) Moderately
( ) Not at all

d. How would you rate the usefulness of the seminars?
( ) Extremely helpful
( ) Somewhat helpful
( ) Not at all helpful

5. The following scales apply to the cooperating teacher you work with most:

a. How helpful is your cooperating teacher?

Extremely Helpful ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ Not at All Helpful

b. How competent is your cooperating teacher in his/her own teaching?

Extremely Competent ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ Not at All Competent

c. How competent is your cooperating teacher in working with you?

Extremely Competent ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ Not at All Competent

6. Who is responsible for evaluating your work as a student teacher?

( ) College or University Person
( ) School Person
( ) Other ______________________________
write in

7. How many regular teachers do you have helping you?

( ) one
( ) two
( ) three
( ) more than three

8. Were others expectations of you made clear before you began? ( ) YES ( ) NO
Are they clear now? ( ) YES ( ) NO

9. Do you feel that you are unfairly being used for your services while the school and university are unduly benefiting?

( ) YES ( ) NO

10. In terms of the amount of responsibility you have, is it

( ) Too much responsibility?
( ) About right?
( ) Too little responsibility?

11. How do you feel about your student teaching experience?

As some sort of flunky	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	As some sort of established teacher

12. Have you suggested changes in the student teacher system?
( ) YES ( ) NO If yes, what was the response?

____

____

____

____

13. To what extent do you feel prepared to assume the functions of a teacher:

a. In a rural school?

Very well Prepared	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Not at All Prepared

b. In a suburban school?

Very well Prepared	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Not at All Prepared

c. In an urban school (other than inner city)?

Very well Prepared	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Not at All Prepared

d. In an inner city school?

Very well Prepared	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Not at All Prepared

14. Do you like kids now more or less than before student teaching?

( ) like kids a great deal more
( ) like kids somewhat more
( ) about the same
( ) like kids somewhat less
( ) like kids a great deal less

15. Do you like the thought of being a teacher now more or less than before student teaching?

( ) like thought a great deal more
( ) like thought somewhat more
( ) about the same
( ) like thought somewhat less
( ) like thought about the same

16. When you begin teaching, would you like to teach kids older or younger than the ones you experienced in student teaching?

( ) older
( ) about the same
( ) younger

17. If you could change the system what would it be?

____

____

____

18. What do you think your chances are for obtaining a teaching job?

( ) Extremely good
( ) Pretty good
( ) Only fair
( ) Pretty bad
( ) Extremely bad

19. How many credit hours of formal education courses have you had?

____ Semester hours
____ Quarter hours

20. Do you intend to teach after completing your program?
( ) YES ( ) NO
If NO: Did your student teaching experience change your mind?
( ) YES ( ) NO

21. Where would you prefer to teach?

( ) Rural
( ) Suburban
( ) Urban (other than inner city)
( ) Inner city

22. Did you choose to student teach where you are now?

( ) YES ( ) NO

If No: What kind of school did you prefer?

( ) Rural
( ) Suburban
( ) Urban (other than inner city)
( ) Inner city

23. How helpful have your education courses been to you in practice?

Extremely Useful ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Not at All Useful

24. Does the content of your education courses have more meaning now?

( ) YES ( ) NO

25. Are the schools as you thought they were?

( ) YES ( ) NO

26. How has your concept of a teacher been altered? If so, how?

____

____

____

27. To what extent do you study (as opposed to work with) other teachers?

( ) Very frequently
( ) Frequently
( ) Infrequently
( ) Hardly ever

28. To what extent do you study (as opposed to work with) other grade levels?

( ) Very frequently
( ) Frequently
( ) Infrequently
( ) Hardly ever

29. To what extent do you work with other teachers?

( ) Very frequently
( ) Frequently
( ) Infrequently
( ) Hardly ever

30. To what extent do you work with other grade levels?

( ) Very frequently
( ) Frequently
( ) Infrequently
( ) Hardly ever

31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

____

____

____

32. Is it as you thought? How so? How not?

____

____

____

33. Has your concept of kids changed?

( ) YES ( ) NO

If YES, How?

34. Has your concept of yourself changed?

( ) YES ( ) NO

If YES, How?

35. To what extent do you get cooperation and help from adults in the school other than your cooperating teacher?
Others are:

( ) Extremely helpful
( ) Somewhat helpful
( ) Neutral
( ) Not very helpful
( ) Not at all helpful

36. How many weeks have you been student teaching? ____ weeks

37. How many weeks into the student term before you had complete charge of a class? ____ weeks

38. Do you feel reasonably competent in your content area? ( ) YES ( ) NO

What is your content area? ______________________

39. To what extent are you aware of resources available to you in your school?

( ) Extremely familiar
( ) Somewhat familiar
( ) Not at all familiar

40. To what extent are you aware of resources available in the community?

( ) Extremely familiar
( ) Somewhat familiar
( ) Not at all familiar

41. How much time do you spend in preparing for teaching per day? ____ hours

42. Are you expected to attend the staff meetings and other activities that your cooperating teacher is expected to be in?

( ) YES ( ) NO

43. Statistical data

a. Your age ____
b. Name of the school you are student teaching in ______________
c. How would you describe the elementary and secondary schools you attended?

( ) Rural
( ) Suburban
( ) Urban (other than inner city)
( ) Inner city

d. Was the school you attended ( ) Public? ( ) Private/Parochial?
e. What kind of school are you student teaching in?

( ) Rural
( ) Suburban
( ) Urban (other than inner city)
( ) Inner city

f. Is the school you are student teaching in: ( ) Public ( ) Private/Parochial
g. What is the approximate pupil enrollment of your school ______
h. For elementary only: How many teachers in your school? (not counting student teachers) ______
For departmental structure only: How many teachers in your department? ______
i. For elementary only: How many student teachers in your school? ______
For departmental structure only: How many student teachers in your department? ____
j. What is your college or university?

____

k. Circle the grade level(s) of your student teaching experience.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

l. Comments about this questionnaire or items on it.
____
____
____
____
____

APPENDIX I

COMPUTER PROGRAM

SPSS

COOPERATING TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Page 1 of 4

```
 1. RUN NAME        CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
 2. FILE NAME       QUESTIONS FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
 3. VARIABLE LIST   VAR001 TO VAR045
 4. INPUT MEDIUM    CARD
 5. SUBFILE LIST    SHAKER,KIRK,PROSPECT,MENTOR,CLEVHTS,JFK,TAYLOR,HAWKEN,BMS,SOUTH,
 6.                 ARLING,GILGLEN,NOROLM,STJOHN
 7. + OF CASES      8,8,5,7,6,2,4,2,6,2,11,4,20,31

INDEFINITE REPETITION, THE INPUT FORMAT PROVIDES FOR  45 VARIABLES.   45 WILL BE READ.
ES FOR  1 RECORDS (-CARDS-) PER CASE.  A MAXIMUM OF   47 -COLUMNS- ARE USED ON A RECORD.

 8. INPUT FORMAT    FIXED(40F1.0,2F2.0,3F1.0)
 9. PRINT FORMATS   VAR001 TO VAR045 (0)
10. VAR LABELS      VAR001,AWARE BEFORE WOULD HAVE STUDENT TEACHER./
11.                 VAR002.IF TRAINED FOR SUPERVISOR--HOW HELPFUL./
12.                 VAR003,ASK FOR STUDENT TEACHER./
13.                 VAR004,IF HAD S.T.BEFORE WAS EXPERIENCE HELPFUL/
14.                 VAR005,HAVE ASSISTANCE DURING TERM./
15.                 VAR006,WHAT IS NATURE OF ASSISTANCE./
16.                 VAR007,HOW KNOWLEDGEABLE IS STUDENT TEACHER./
17.                 VAR008,HOW DOES STUDENT TEACHER RELATE TO KIDS./
18.                 VAR009,HOW DOES STUD. TEACH. RELATE TO ADULTS./
19.                 VAR010,HOW MANY STUD. TEACH. RESPONSIBLE FOR./
20.                 VAR011,TRAINING SESSIONS FOR TEACHERS./
21.                 VAR012,RESPONSE TO SUGGESTED CHANGES/
22.                 VAR013,WHAT CHANGES DESIRED./
23.                 VAR014,IS STUDENT PREPARED FOR RURAL SCHOOL.
24.                 VAR015,IS STUDENT PREPARED FOR SUBURBAN SCHOOL./
25.                 VAR016,IS STUDENT PREPARED FOR URBAN SCHOOL./
26.                 VAR017,IS STUDENT PREPARED FOR INNER CITY./
27.                 VAR018,EXPECTATIONS OF YOU CLEAR AT START./
28.                 VAR019,HOW ARE EXPECTATIONS OF YOU DETERMINED./
29.                 VAR020,HOW ARE YOU COMPENSATED./
30.                 VAR021,HOW WELL WAS STUD. PREPARED AT START./
31.                 VAR022,PERCENT OF TIME SPENT TEACHING/
32.                 VAR023,PERCENT TIME SPENT WITH STUDENT TEACHER/
33.                 VAR024,PERCENT TIME ON OTHER DUTIES/
34.                 VAR025,HOW MANY YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE./
35.                 VAR026,YEARS WORKED WITH STUDENT TEACHERS/
36.                 VAR027.HOW MANY STUDENTS WORKED WITH./
```

APPENDIX I

COMPUTER PROGRAM

COOPERATING TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

```
37.                       VAR028,HOW HAS EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY CHANGED./
38.                       VAR029,HAVE SET SCHEDULE OF EXPERIENCES FOR ST./
39.                       VAR030,WHAT ARE YOU NOT PREPARED FOR./
40.                       VAR031,MOST EFFECTIVE CONTRIB. OF UNIV../
41.                       VAR032,AGE/
42.                       VAR033,TYPE OF SCHOOLS ATTENDED/
43.                       VAR034,KIND OF SCHOOL ATTENDED/
44.                       VAR035,KIND OF SCHOOL TEACHING IN/
45.                       VAR036,IS SCHOOL PUBLIC./
46.                       VAR037,ENROLLMENT/
47.                       VAR038,COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY - UNDERGRADUATE/
48.                       VAR039,COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY - GRADUATE/
49.                       VAR040,LEVEL OF STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE/
50.                       VAR041,SCHOOL CODE/
51.                       VAR042,CLUSTER CODE/
52.                       VAR043,ELEMENTARY-SECONDARY CODE/
53.                       VAR044,SIZE CODE/
54.                       VAR045,TYPE OF CENTER CODE/
55. VALUE LABELS          VAR001(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)WEEK OR LESS(3)2-3 WEEKS
56.                       (4)4-5(5)6-7(6)8-9(7)10-11(8)OVER 11(9)YES - NOT SPECIFIED/
57.                       VAR002,VAR004(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)YES, EXTREMELY
58.                       (3)YES, SOMEWHAT(4)YES, NOT AT ALL (5)YES, NOT SPECIFIED/
59.                       VAR003(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)YES/
60.                       VAR005(0)NO ANSWER(1)YES-COLLEGE OR UNIV.
61.                       (2)YES-SCHOOL DISTRICT(3)YES-BOTH(4)YES-UNSPECIFIED(5)NO/
62.                       VAR006,(0)NO ANSWER(1)SEMINARS,MEETINGS(2)CENTER COORDINATOR
63.                       (3)DIR OF STU TEACHING(4)TEACHERS(5)DEPT SUPERVISOR
64.                       (6)NOT HELPFUL(7)OTHER(8)NO ON PREVIOUS Q.
65.                       (9)YES,NOT SPECIFIED/
66.                       VAR007,(0)NO ANSWER(1)EXTREMELY(2)SOMEWHAT(3)NEUTRAL
67.                       (4)NOT VERY(5)NOT AT ALL/
68.                       VAR008,VAR009(0)NO ANSWER(1)EXTREMELY WELL(2)FAIRLY WELL
69.                       (3)NEUTRAL(4)NOT VERY WELL(5)NOT RELATE AT ALL/
70.                       VAR010,(0)NO ANSWER(1)ONE(2)TWO(3)THREE(4)FOUR(5)FIVE
71.                       (6)SIX(7)SEVEN(8)GREATER THAN 7(9)NONE/
72.                       VAR011(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)YES-NOT SPECIFIED(3)YES-COLLEGE
73.                       (4)YES-SCHOOL(5)YES-BOTH/
74.                       VAR012,(0)NO ANSWER(1)NONE SUGGESTED(2)TOO EARLY TO TELL
75.                       (3)IGNORED,NO RESPONSE(4)NOT IMPLEMENTED(5)FAVORABLY RECEIVED
```

APPENDIX I

COMPUTER PROGRAM

COOPERATING TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

```
(6)IMPLEMENTED(7)OTHER(9)NO RESPONSE STATED/
VAR013,(0)NO ANSWER(1)MORE FLD EXPERIENCES(2)LONGER STU TEACHING
(3)MORE HELP FROM UNIV(4)LET SCHOOLS DO MORE
(5)ASSESS SKILLS FIRST(6)MORE LESSON PLAN TNG
(7)CAREFUL PLACEMENT(8)LIGHTEN S.T. CLASSES(9)OK AS IS/
VAR014 TO VAR017,VAR021(0)NO ANSWER(1)VERY WELL PREPARED
(2)SOMEWHAT PREPARED(3)NEUTRAL(4)SOMEWHAT UNPREPARED
(5)NOT AT ALL PREPARED/
VAR018(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)YES(3)BOTH/
VAR019(0)NO ANSWER(1)JOINTLY(2)PRIMARILY SCHOOL
(3)PRIMARILY COLLEGE/
VAR020(0)NO ANSWER(1)CASH,STIPEND(2)LESS THAN $50
(3)NOT COMPENSATED(4)$50 OR MORE(5)VARIES(6)FREE COURSES
(7)COURSES AND STIPEND(8)OTHER(9)DONT KNOW/
VAR022(0)NO ANSWER(1)90-100%(2)80-89%(3)70-79%(4)60-69%
(5)50-59%(6)40-49%(7)30-39%(8)BELOW 30%(9)VARIES/
VAR023,VAR024(0)NO ANSWER(1)71-100%(2)61-70%(3)51-60%
(4)41-50%(5)31-40%(6)21-30%(7)11-20%(8)0-10%(9)VARIES/
VAR025,VAR026(0)NO ANSWER(1)ZERO(2)LESS THAN YEAR(3)1 YEAR
(4)2-3 YEARS(5)4-5 YEARS(6)6-10 YEARS(7)11-15 YEARS
(8)16-20 YEARS(9)MORE THAN 20 YEARS/
VAR027(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO STUDENT TEACHERS(2)1 STUDENT TEACHER
(3)2-3(4)4-5(5)6-10(6)11-15(7)16-20(8)21-49(9)OVER 49/
VAR028,(0)NO ANSWER(1)NONE,NOT MUCH(2)SLIGHTLY,SOME
(3)YES,UNSPECIFIED(4)BY WORK WITH S.T.(5)BROADENED
(6)REALIZE POOR ED CRS(7)MISPLACED TEACHERS(9)OTHER/
VAR029(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)YES(3)VARIES WITH STUDENT/
VAR030(0)NO ANSWER(1)NONE(2)PHYS,EMOTION PROB(3)SEMINARS,UNIV.
(4)EVALUATION(5)DISCIPLINE(6)UNQUALIFIED S.T.-S(7)INNOVATION
(8)ADVISING(9)OTHER/
VAR031,(0)NO ANSWER,DONT KNOW(1)TRAINING FOR COOP T.
(2)FREE TUITION(3)GRADUATE CREDIT(4)BETTER PRE S.T EXP
(5)IN-SERVICE(6)PLANNING HELP(7)PHIL OF ED FOR S.T.
(8)PREPARE FOR DUTIES(9)OTHER/
VAR032(0)NO ANSWER(1)20-24 YEARS OLD(2)25-29(3)30-34(4)35-39
(5)40-44(6)45-49(7)50-54(8)OVER54/
VAR033,VAR035(0)NO ANSWER(1)RURAL(2)SUBURBAN(3)URBAN
(4)INNER CITY(5)URBAN&SUBURBAN(6)INNER CITY&SUBURBAN
(7)INNER CITY&URBAN/
```

APPENDIX I

COMPUTER PROGRAM

COOPERATING TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Page 4 of 4

```
                VAR034,VAR036(0)NO ANSWER(1)PUBLIC(2)PRIVATE,PAROCHIAL(3)BOTH/
                VAR037(0)NO ANSWER(1)LESS THAN 250(2)251-500(3)501-750
                (4)751-1000(5)1001-1500(6)1501-2000(7)OVER 2000/
                VAR038,VAR039(0)NO ANSWER(1)BALDWIN-WALLACE
                (2)CASE WESTERN RESERVE(3)CLEVELAND STATE(4)CUY COM COLLEGE
                (5)JOHN CARROLL(6)NOTRE DAME(7) ST. JOHN COLLEGE (8)URSULINE
                (9)OTHER/
                VAR040,(0)NO ANSWER(1)GRADES K-3(2)4-6(3)7-9(4)10-12(5)K-6
                (6)7-12(7)1-12(8)OTHER/
MISSING VALUES  VAR001(0,1)/VAR006(8,9)/VAR010(0,9)/VAR011(0,1)/
                VAR012(0,1,9)/VAR013(0,9)/VAR014 TO VAR017,VAR021(0)
PROCESS SBFILESEACH
CODEBOOK        VAR001 TO VAR040
STATISTICS      1
READ INPUT DATA
(DATA FILE)

PROCESS SBFILESALL
CODEBOOK        VAR001 TO VAR040
STATISTICS      1
FINISH
```

APPENDIX J

COMPUTER PROGRAM

SPSS

STUDENT TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

```
  1. RUN NAME         CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
  2. FILE NAME        STUDENT TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
  3. VARIABLE LIST    QUES001,QUES002,QUES003,QUES004,QUES04A,QUES04B,QUES04C,
  4.                  QUES04D,QUES05A,QUES05B,QUES05C,QUES006,QUES007,QUES08A,
  5.                  QUES08B,QUES009,QUES010,QUES011,QUES012,QUES13A,QUES13B,
  6.                  QUES13C.QUES13D,QUES014,QUES015,QUES016,QUES017,QUES018,
  7.                  QUES019,QUES020,QUES021,QUES022,QUES023,QUES024,QUES025,
  8.                  QUES026,QUES027,QUES028,QUES029,QUES030,QUES031,QUES032,
  9.                  QUES033.QUES034,QUES035,QUES036,QUES037,QUES38A,QUES38B,
 10.                  QUES039,QUES040,QUES041,QUES042,QUES43A,QUES43C,
 11.                  QUES43D,QUES43E,QUES43F,QUES43J,QUES43K,QUES43L,QUES43M,
 12.                  QUES43N,QUES044
 13. INPUT MEDIUM     CARD
 14. SUBFILE LIST     SHAKER,PROSPECT,MENTOR,CLEVHTS,TAYLOR,HAWKEN,BMS,SOUTH,
 15.                  ARLING,GILGLEN,NOROLM,STJOHN
 16. + OF CASES       6,5,3,5,3,2,8,1,7,3,19,32

INDEFINITE REPETITION, THE INPUT FORMAT PROVIDES FOR  64 VARIABLES.   64 WILL BE READ.
ES FOR  1 RECORDS (-CARDS-) PER CASE.  A MAXIMUM OF   66 -COLUMNS- ARE USED ON A RECORD.

 17. INPUT FORMAT     FIXED(60F1.0,2F2.0,2F1.0)
 18. PRINT FORMAT     QUES001 TO QUES044 (0)
 19. VAR LABELS       QUES001,HOW YOU FELT ABOUT S.T. EXPERIENCE./
 20.                  QUES002,WHAT YOU PARTICULARLY LIKED ABOUT S.T./
 21.                  QUES003,WHAT YOU PARTICULARLY DISLIKED ABOUT S.T/
 22.                  QUES004,DID YOU ATTEND SEMINARS HELD BY COLLEGE./
 23.                  QUES04A,WHERE WERE SEMINARS HELD./
 24.                  QUES04B,WHO CONDUCTED THE SEMINARS./
 25.                  QUES04C.ABLE TO SHARE EXPERIENCES WITH S.T./
 26.                  QUES04D.HOW USEFUL WERE SEMINARS./
 27.                  QUES05A.HOW HELPFUL IS YOUR COOPERATING TEACHER./
 28.                  QUES05B,HOW COMPETENT COOP TEACHER IN TEACHING./
 29.                  QUES05C,HOW COMPETENT COOP TEACHER WITH YOU./
 30.                  QUES006,WHO EVALUATES YOUR WORK AS S.T./
 31.                  QUES007,HOW MANY REGULAR TEACHERS HELP YOU./
 32.                  QUES08A,OTHERS EXPECTATIONS CLEAR BEFORE S.T./
 33.                  QUES08B.OTHERS EXPECTATIONS CLEAR NOW./
 34.                  QUES009,UNFAIRLY USED FOR YOUR SERVICES./
 35.                  QUES010,HOW MUCH RESPONSIBILITY DO YOU HAVE./
 36.                  QUES011.HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT S.T. EXPERIENCE./
```

APPENDIX J

COMPUTER PROGRAM

STUDENT TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Page 2 of 6

```
QUES012,SUGGESTED CHANGES IN S.T. SYSTEM./
QUES13A,HOW PREPARED TO TEACH IN RURAL SCHOOL./
QUES13B,HOW PREPARED TO TEACH IN SUBURBAN SCHOOL/
QUES13C,HOW PREPARED TO TEACH IN URBAN SCHOOL./
QUES13D,HOW PREPARED TO TEACH IN INNER CITY./
QUES014,LIKE KIDS MORE OR LESS THAN BEFORE S.T./
QUES015,LIKE IDEA OF TEACHING MORE OR LESS NOW./
QUES016,WANT AGE OF KIDS TO DIFFER THAN WHEN S.T/
QUES017,WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE IN THE SYSTEM./
QUES018,HOW ARE CHANCES OF GETTING TEACHING JOB./
QUES019,HOW MANY EDUCATION CREDITS DO YOU HAVE./
QUES020,INTEND TO TEACH AFTER COMPLETING PROGRAM/
QUES021,WHERE WOULD YOU PREFER TO TEACH./
QUES022,DID YOU CHOOSE TO S.T. WHERE YOU ARE NOW/
QUES023,HOW USEFUL HAVE EDUCATION COURSES BEEN./
QUES024,EDUCATION COURSES MORE MEANINGFUL NOW./
QUES025,ARE THE SCHOOLS AS YOU THOUGHT THEY WERE/
QUES026,CONCEPT OF TEACHER ALTERED--IF SO HOW./
QUES027,EXTENT YOU STUDY OTHER TEACHERS./
QUES028,EXTENT YOU STUDY OTHER GRADE LEVELS./
QUES029,EXTENT YOU WORK WITH OTHER TEACHERS./
QUES030,EXTENT YOU WORK WITH OTHER GRADE LEVELS./
QUES031,WHY DID YOU AGREE TO S.T. IN THIS SCHOOL/
QUES032,IS IT AS YOU THOUGHT--HOW SO OR HOW NOT./
QUES033,HAS YOUR CONCEPT OF KIDS CHANGED--HOW./
QUES034,YOUR CONCEPT OF YOURSELF CHANGED--HOW./
QUES035,HOW HELPFUL ADULTS IN THE SCHOOL./
QUES036,HOW MANY WEEKS HAVE YOU BEEN S.T./
QUES037,WHEN DID YOU BECOME IN CHARGE OF A CLASS/
QUES38A,ARE YOU COMPETENT IN YOUR CONTENT AREA./
QUES38B,WHAT IS YOUR CONTENT AREA./
QUES039,HOW AWARE OF RESOURCES IN YOUR SCHOOL./
QUES040,HOW AWARE OF RESOURCES IN YOUR COMMUNITY/
QUES041,HOW MUCH TEACHING PREPARATION PER DAY./
QUES042,ATTEND MEETINGS THAT COOP TEACHER IS IN./
QUES43A,YOUR AGE./
QUES43C,ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY SCHOOL ATTENDED./
QUES43D,ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY SCHOOL ATTENDED./
QUES43E,KIND OF SCHOOL STUDENT TEACHING IN./
```

APPENDIX J

COMPUTER PROGRAM

STUDENT TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Page 3 of 6

```
 76.                    QUES43F,KIND OF SCHOOL STUDENT TEACHING IN./
 77.                    QUES43J,YOUR COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY./
 78.                    QUES43K,GRADE LEVEL OF S.T. EXPERIENCE./
 79.                    QUES43L,SCHOOL CODE./
 80.                    QUES43M,CENTER CODE./
 81.                    QUES43N,ELEMENTARY-SECONDARY CODE./
 82.                    QUES044,SIZE CODE./
 83. VALUE LABELS       QUES001(0)NO ANSWER(1)DEFINITELY DISLIKED(2)DISLIKED--SOMEWHAT
 84.                    (3)NEUTRAL(4)LIKED--SOMEWHAT(5)DEFINITELY LIKED/
 85.                    QUES002(0)NO ANSWER(1)ALL OF IT(2)STUDENTS(3)CO-OPERATING TEACHER
 86.                    (4)WORK IN OPEN-SCHOOL(5)TEAM TEACHING(6)LEARN BY DOING
 87.                    (7)OBSERVING, TAPING(8)FREEDOM, CREATIVITY(9)OTHER/
 88.                    QUES003(0)NO ANSWER(1)NOTHING(2)DETAILED LESSON PLAN
 89.                    (3)DISIPLN, STU ATITUDE(4)METHOD,SEMNAR,OBSERV
 90.                    (5)SCHEDULE, TIME PROB.(6)NOT ENOUGH GUIDANCE
 91.                    (7)NOT ENOUGH FREEDOM(8)NOT ACCEPTED(9)OTHER/
 92.                    QUES004,QUES08A,QUES08B,QUES009,QUES024(0)NO ANSWER(1)YES(2)NO/
 93.                    QUES025,QUES38A,QUES042(0)NO ANSWER(1)YES(2)NO/
 94.                    QUES04A(0)NO ANS--QUES.4 IS NO(1)ANSWER NOT SPECIFIED
 95.                    (2)S.T. SITE(3)COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY(4)BOTH(5)OTHER--NO WRITE IN
 96.                    (6)OTHER--PROFS HOME(7)OTHER--AREA SCHOOL(8)OTHER--COLLEGE, ETC./
 97.                    QUES04B(0)NO ANS--QUES.4 IS NO(1)ANSWER NOT SPECIFIED
 98.                    (2)COLLEGE PERSON(3)SCHOOL PERSON(4)BOTH(5)OTHER--NO WRITE IN
 99.                    (6)BOTH, SPEC. SPEAKERS/
100.                    QUES04C(0)NO ANS--QUES.4 IS NO(1)ANSWER NOT SPECIFIED
101.                    (2)SHARE HEAVILY(3)SHARE MODERATELY(4)SHARE NOT AT ALL/
102.                    QUES04D(0)NO ANS--QUES.4 IS NO(1)ANSWER NOT SPECIFIED
103.                    (2)EXTREMELY USEFUL(3)SOMEWHAT USEFUL(4)NOT AT ALL USEFUL/
104.                    QUES05A,QUES023,QUES035(0)NO ANSWER(1)EXTREMELY HELPFUL
105.                    (2)SOMEWHAT HELPFUL(3)NEUTRAL(4)NOT VERY HELPFUL
106.                    (5)NOT AT ALL HELPFUL/
107.                    QUES05B,QUES05C(0)NO ANSWER(1)EXTREMELY COMPETENT
108.                    (2)SOMEWHAT COMPETENT(3)NEUTRAL(4)NOT VERY COMPETENT
109.                    (5)NOT AT ALL COMPETENT/
110.                    QUES006(0)NO ANSWER(1)COLLEGE PERSON(2)SCHOOL PERSON(3)BOTH
111.                    (4)OTHER--TEACHING TEAM/
112.                    QUES007(0)NO ANSWER(1)ONE TEACHER(2)TWO TEACHERS(3)THREE TEACHERS
```

APPENDIX J

COMPUTER PROGRAM

STUDENT TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Page 4 of 6

```
(4)MORE THAN 3 TEACHERS/
QUES010(0)NO ANSWER(1)TOO MUCH(2)ABOUT RIGHT(3)TOO LITTLE/
QUES011(0)NO ANSWER(1)SOME SORT OF FLUNKY(2)NOT QUITE FLUNKY
(3)NEUTRAL(4)NOT QUITE A TEACHER(5)ESTABLISHED TEACHER/
QUES012(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO SUGGESTIONS MADE(2)TOO EARLY TO TELL
(3)IGNORED, NO RESPONSE(4)REPLIED TO,NO ACTION
(5)RECEPTIVE, FAVORABLE(6)IMPLEMENTED(9)YES--NOT SPECIFIED/
QUES13A,QUES13B,QUES13C,QUES13D(0)NO ANSWER(1)VERY WELL PREPARED
(2)SOMEWHAT PREPARED(3)NEUTRAL(4)NOT VERY PREPARED
(5)NOT AT ALL PREPARED/
QUES014,QUES015(0)NO ANSWER(1)LIKE MUCH MORE(2)LIKE SOMEWHAT MORE
(3)LIKE ABOUT THE SAME(4)LIKE SOMEWHAT LESS(5)LIKE MUCH LESS/
QUES016(0)NO ANSWER(1)TEACH OLDER KIDS(2)TEACH SAME AGE
(3)TEACH YOUNGER KIDS(4)SAME AGE OR OLDER(5)SAME AGE OR YOUNGER/
QUES017(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO CHANGE. TOO EARLY
(2)IMPROVE FIELD EXPER.(3)MORE INDIVIDUALIZED(4)MORE FREEDOM
(5)SOME PAY(6)A FULL TEACHING DAY(7)EASE L.P.PREPARATION
(8)OTHER(9)NEED COMPLETE CHANGE/
QUES018(0)NO ANSWER(1)EXTREMELY GOOD(2)PRETTY GOOD(3)ONLY FAIR
(4)PRETTY BAD(5)EXTREMELY BAD/
QUES019(0)NO ANSWER(1)1-30 SEMESTER HRS(2)31-60 SEMESTER HRS
(3)61-120 SEMESTER HRS(4)OVER 120 SEMESTER HR/
QUES020(0)NO ANSWER(1)YES-INTEND TO TEACH
(2)NO-S.T. CHANGED MIND(3)NO-ST DIDNT CHG MIND(4)UNDECIDED/
QUES021(0)NO ANSWER(1)RURAL AREA(2)SUBURBAN AREA(3)URBAN AREA
(4)INNER CITY AREA(5)ANY AREA(6)RURAL OR SUBURBAN
(7)URBAN OR SUBURBAN(8)INNER C. OR SUBURBAN/
QUES022(0)NO ANSWER(1)YES(2)NO-PREFER RURAL
(3)NO-PREFER SUBURBAN(4)NO-PREFER URBAN
(5)NO-PREFER INNER CITY(6)NO-NOTHING SPECIFIED/
QUES026(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)MORE DEMANDING(3)HARDER TO DISCIPLINE
(4)STUDENT RAPPORT HARD(5)MORE RESPONSIBILITY
(6)MORE EXCITING(7)COURSES UNREALISTIC(9)OTHER/
QUES027.QUES028.QUES029,QUES030(0)NO ANSWER
(1)VERY FREQUENTLY(2)FREQUENTLY(3)INFREQUENTLY
(4)HARDLY EVER/
QUES031(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO CHOICE(2)CONVENIENT. LIKED IT
(3)IT WAS TRADITIONAL(4)WANTED OPEN SCHOOL
```

APPENDIX J

COMPUTER PROGRAM

STUDENT TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Page 5 of 6

```
151.    (5)IT WAS PROGRESSIVE(6)WANTED PUBLIC SCHOOL
152.    (7)WANTED CHALLENGE(8)PRE-S.T. AT SCHOOL(9)OTHER/
153.    QUES032(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO PRECONCEIVED IDEA(2)YES
154.    (3)EVEN BETTER(4)YES-MORE FREEDOM
155.    (5)YES-BETTER EQUIPPED(6)NO(7)MORE STU. PROBLEMS
156.    (8)MORE STRUCTURED(9)OTHER/
157.    QUES033(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)YES, NOT SPECIFIED(3)GREAT ACHIEVERS
158.    (4)MORE MATURE(5)HARDER TO HANDLE(6)HARDER-KEEP INTEREST
159.    (7)LESS MATURE(8)NEED MORE RESPECT(9)OTHER/
160.    QUES034(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO CHANGE(2)YES, NOT SPECIFIED
161.    (3)FEEL MORE CONFIDENT(4)BETTER THAN REALIZED(5)IM LESS PREPARED
162.    (6)IMP. OF PATIENCE(7)AWARE IMP. OF CARING(8)AWARE MY WEAKNESSES
163.    (9)OTHER/
164.    QUES036,QUES037(0)NO ANSWER OR NONE(1)1-2 WEEKS
165.    (2)3-4 WEEKS(3)5-6 WEEKS(4)7-8 WEEKS(5)9-10 WEEKS
166.    (6)11-12 WEEKS(7)MORE THAN 12 WEEKS/
167.    QUES38B(0)NO ANSWER(1)SCIENCE(2)SOCIAL SCIENCE(3)MATH
168.    (4)HISTORY(5)ENGLISH(6)READING(7)OTHER(8)ELEMENTARY EDUCATION
169.    (9)SECONDARY EDUCATION/
170.    QUES039,QUES040(0)NO ANSWER(1)EXTREMELY FAMILIAR
171.    (2)SOMEWHAT FAMILIAR(3)NOT AT ALL FAMILIAR/
172.    QUES041(0)NO ANSWER(1)LESS THAN 1 HOUR(2)1 HOUR
173.    (3)2 HOURS(4)3 HOURS(5)4 HOURS(6)5 HOURS(7)6-8 HOURS
174.    (8)9-10 HOURS(9)MORE THAN 10 HOURS/
175.    QUES43A(0)NO ANSWER(1)20-24 YEARS OLD(2)25-29 YEARS OLD
176.    (3)30-34 YEARS OLD(4)35-39 YEARS OLD(5)40-44 YEARS OLD
177.    (6)45-49 YEARS OLD(7)50-54 YEARS OLD(8)OVER 55 YEARS OLD/
178.    QUES43C,QUES43E(0)NO ANSWER(1)RURAL AREA(2)SUBURBAN AREA
179.    (3)URBAN AREA(4)INNER CITY AREA(5)URBAN & SUBURBAN
180.    (6)INNER CTY & SUBURBAN(7)INNER CITY & URBAN
181.    (8)RURAL & SUBURBAN(9)RURAL & URBAN/
182.    QUES43D,QUES43F(0)NO ANSWER(1)PUBLIC SCHOOL
183.    (2)PRIVATE, PAROCHIAL(3)BOTH/
184.    QUES43J(0)NO ANSWER(1)BALDWIN-WALLACE(2)CASE WESTERN RESERVE
185.    (3)CLEVELAND STATE(4)CUYAHOGA COMMUNITY(5)JOHN CARROLL
186.    (6)NOTRE DAME(7)ST. JOHN COLLEGE(8)URSULINE(9)OTHER/
```

APPENDIX J

COMPUTER PROGRAM

STUDENT TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Page 6 of 6

```
187. MISSING VALUES QUES04A TO QUES04D,QUES012(0,1)
188. PROCESS SBFILESEACH
189. CODEBOOK        QUES001 TO QUES43K
190. STATISTICS      1
191. READ INPUT DATA

     (DATA FILE)

192. PROCESS SBFILESALL
193. CODEBOOK       QUES001 TO QUES43K
194. STATISTICS     1
195. FINISH
```

APPENDIX K

DESCRIPTION OF THE STATISTICAL PACKAGE FOR THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

The questionnaire evaluation system described in this report uses a computerized approach to the tabulation of the student teacher and cooperating teacher questionnaires. Without a computerized approach, the task of preparing the tabulations for individual centers would be a very large task.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) is a set of computer programs designed to simplify the tabulation of data of the type obtained through questionnaires.

The set of computer programs constituting SPSS can be found in most large computer facilities and many smaller ones particularly those associated with colleges and universities. The programs can be easily tailored to handle the results of a wide variety of questionnaires.

A variety of options are available including from a straight tabulation through crosstabulations and multivariate analyses. The option used to prepare the tabulations which appear in Appendices I and J is called CODEBOOK.

A manual which describes SPSS is available at computer facilities, at campus bookstores, or can be obtained from the publisher as shown below:

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
Norman Nie, Dale Bent, and C. Hull

McGraw Hill Book Company
330 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036